arXiv:1702.08596v1 [math-ph] 28 Feb 2017

The interplay between Dirac systems, Morse families and Interconnection

M. Barbero-Liñán[§,‡], H. Cendra[†], E. García-Toraño Andrés[†], and D. Martín de Diego[‡]

§ Departamento de Matemática Aplicada, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Av. Juan de Herrera 4, 28040 Madrid, Spain

† Departamento de Matemática, Universidad Nacional del Sur, CONICET Av. Alem 1253, 8000 Bahía Blanca, Argentina

‡ Instituto de Ciencias Matemáticas (CSIC-UAM-UC3M-UCM) C/Nicolás Cabrera 13-15, 28049 Madrid, Spain

Abstract

We provide a generalization of the notion of Dirac system by using Morse families to intrinsically embrace the dynamics associated with different physical systems such as constrained variational calculus, optimal control, Lagrangian mechanics, etc., from both the Lagrangian and the Hamiltonian viewpoint. Besides, we introduce a geometric construction of Port-Dirac systems and use it to describe the interconnection of Dirac systems. Special emphasis on theoretical and applied examples is given throughout the paper to show the applicability of the proposed framework.

1 Introduction

Dirac structures were introduced in [Courant and Weinstein, 1988], partially motivated by the Dirac theory of constraints. Dirac structures have proven to be very useful in the modeling of physical systems. A systematic study of the fundamental questions about Dirac structures, including a notion of integrability in terms of the Courant bracket, can be found in [Courant, 1990]. Presymplectic forms and Poisson brackets can be regarded as particular instances of Dirac structures. The integrability condition of the corresponding Dirac structure in these cases corresponds to the closedness of the presymplectic form and the Jacobi identity of the Poisson bracket, respectively. This integrability condition, however, is too restrictive to include many important systems such as nonholonomic mechanics. This is the reason why in this work we will not include the integrability condition in the definition of Dirac structure, which is the same convention used in e.g. [Yoshimura and Marsden, 2006].

Dirac systems. A Dirac structure is a certain subbundle D of $TM \oplus T^*M$ over M. Given an energy function E on M one can write the following system

$$(x, \dot{x}) \oplus \mathrm{d}E(x) \in D_x, \tag{1.1}$$

which represents an implicit differential equation. The equation (1.1) describes a *Dirac system* (also referred to as an *implicit Hamiltonian system*, see [van der Schaft and Maschke, 1995, Dalsmo and van der Schaft, 1999]). For example, if (M, ω) is a symplectic manifold then one can choose D to be $D = \mathrm{graph}(\omega^\flat)$, and in this case the corresponding Dirac system (1.1) becomes $\omega(x)(\dot{x}, \cdot) = \mathrm{d}E(x)(\cdot)$, which are the well-known Hamilton equations. More generally, we will see that Dirac systems include nonholonomic systems, control systems, optimal control problems, linear Poisson structures on vector bundles (hence, mechanics on algebroids), and many others. For some physical systems, it is convenient to consider a more general notion of Dirac system and allow $\mathrm{d}E(M) \subset T^*M$ be replaced by a more general Lagrangian submanifold of T^*M. In order to represent these Lagrangian submanifolds we will use Morse families (as in [Barbero-Liñán, Iglesias Ponte, and Martín de Diego, 2015]) and more generally, we will consider a certain class of weak Morse families. Thus, the most general system we will be considering on a manifold N is

$$(x, \dot{x}) \oplus \mu_x \in (D_N)_x, \tag{1.2}$$

with $\mu_x \in S_E(x)$, where $S_E \subset T^*N$ is an immersed Lagrangian submanifold induced by a weak Morse family $E\colon M \to \mathbb{R}$. We will call (1.2) a *(generalized) Dirac system.*

We point out that an alternative approach was given by [Grabowska and Grabowski, 2011] from the point of view of the so-called Dirac algebroids.

Port-Dirac Systems. As recognized by A. van der Schaft and collaborators, the notion of Port-Hamiltonian System (see [van der Schaft and Dimitri, 2014, van der Schaft and Maschke, 1995] and references therein) unifies geometric mechanics with network theory. The approach of interconnection is motivated by the paradigm that, often, a complex system can be modeled as the interconnection of a number of simpler subsystems. From this perspective, a good mathematical description of the interconnection will result in a good model of the system under study (for instance, from the standpoint of numerical analysis). The key observation that Dirac structures naturally encode energy-preserving connections among subsystems can be found in [van der Schaft and Maschke, 1995, Dalsmo and van der Schaft, 1999], which also contain some earlier references and examples supporting this claim.

In the "literature on Port-Hamiltonian systems" the Hamiltonian point of view is emphasized. In the present paper, we introduce the notion of *Port-Dirac System* (PD-System) which provides a way of working with either the Hamiltonian or the Lagrangian point of view using a unified formalism. With this approach, we can consider simultaneously many different systems (Hamiltonian, Lagrangian, constrained systems, control problems, and others) with a common framework that uncovers the underlying geometry. Besides, the notion of PD-System is suitable for a systematic use of a categorical language which in many cases results in a better understanding of the systems under study.

It should be mentioned that the geometric structure of Hamiltonian systems with ports has been discussed in the context of Courant algebroids in [Merker, 2009].

Structure of the paper. In Section 2 we provide background to make the text self-contained. This includes basic symplectic geometry, the essential properties of Dirac structures, the notion of forward and backward of a Dirac structure, and some examples. In Section 3 we generalize the concept of Dirac system using the notion of Morse families to generate the dynamics. The main result of this section is Theorem 3.5 where we relate this generalization with the standard notion of Dirac system. In Section 4 we prove that this notion of (generalized) Dirac system covers the most important examples of mechanical and control systems. In particular, we describe at once the cases of standard Hamiltonian and Lagrangian systems, reduced mechanical systems, systems with constraints (both nonholonomic and vakonomic) and optimal control problems. In Section 5 Dirac structures on vector bundles are introduced in preparation for the following sections. Input-Output PD-Systems are discussed in geometrical terms in Section 6, where many illustrative examples are given. In these examples the notion of generalized Dirac system is helpful. A theory of interconnection for these systems is proposed including the standard notions of interconnection in the literature. Finally, in Section 7 we give an overview of a more general notion of PD-System, and show that the composition of PD-Systems is related with the concept of interconnection. The final sections are devoted to future work and two technical appendices.

Acknowledgements. The authors have been partially supported by Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad (MINECO, Spain) under grant MTM 2015-64166-C2-2P. MB and DMdD acknowledge financial support from the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness, through the research grants MTM2013-42870-P, MTM2016-76702-P and "Severo Ochoa Programme for Centres of Excellence" in R&D (SEV-2015-0554). HC thanks the CONICET for financial support. EGTA thanks the CONICET for financial support through a Postdoctoral Grant.

2 Preliminaries

We will review in this section the essential definitions and results we need from Dirac structures and the dynamical system associated to them, to make the text reasonably self-contained.

Basic symplectic geometry (see e.g. [Libermann and Marle, 1987]). A symplectic vector space is a pair (E, Ω) where E is a finite dimensional vector space and $\Omega\colon E\times E \to \mathbb{R}$ is a skew-symmetric bilinear map of maximal rank (in particular, E has even dimension). As usual, we define the isomorphisms $\flat_\Omega : E \to E^*$ by $\flat_\Omega(v) = i_v\Omega$ and $\sharp_\Omega = (\flat_\Omega)^{-1}$. Sometimes, we will denote them by $\Omega^\flat(v)$ and $\Omega^\sharp(v)$, respectively. If $F \subset E$ is a subspace, the Ω-*orthogonal complement of* F is the

subspace defined by

$$F^{\Omega} = \{e \in E \mid \Omega(e, e') = 0 \text{ for all } e' \in F\}\,.$$

A subspace F of a symplectic vector space is called

1) *isotropic* if $F \subset F^{\Omega}$, that is, $\Omega(e, e') = 0$ for all $e, e' \in F$.

2) *coisotropic* if $F^{\Omega} \subset F$, or, equivalently, if F^{Ω} is isotropic.

3) *Lagrangian* if F is isotropic and has an isotropic complement, that is, $E = F \oplus F'$, where F' is isotropic.

Lagrangian subspaces F of E can be characterized by having half the dimension of E and satisfying $\Omega_{|F} = 0$. Note in particular that if $F \subset E$ is a Lagrangian subspace then $\dim F = \dim E/2$.

A symplectic manifold (M, ω) is a differentiable manifold M with a non-degenerate closed 2-form ω on M. Therefore, for each $x \in M$, (T_xM, ω_x) is a symplectic vector space and, in particular, M is even dimensional. The vector bundle isomorphisms $\Omega^{\flat} = \flat_{\omega} \colon TM \to T^*M$ and $\Omega^{\sharp} = (\flat_{\Omega})^{-1} \colon T^*M \to TM$ are defined fiberwise.

Let (M, ω) be a symplectic manifold. An immersed submanifold N, or immersion $f : N \to M$ is isotropic, coisotropic or Lagrangian if so is the space $T_xf(T_xN)$ as a subspace of $T_{f(x)}M$, for each point $x \in N$. Note that an immersion $f \colon N \to M$ is isotropic if and only if $f^*\omega = 0$, and it is Lagrangian if, in addition, the dimension of N is half the dimension of M.

A fundamental example of a symplectic manifold is the cotangent bundle T^*Q of an arbitrary manifold Q. It is equipped with a canonical exact symplectic structure $\omega_Q = -d\theta_Q$ where θ_Q is the canonical 1-form on T^*Q, defined as follows. Denote by $\pi_Q \colon T^*Q \to Q$ the canonical projection, then

$$(\theta_Q)_{\alpha_q}(X_{\alpha_q}) = \langle \alpha_q, T_{\alpha_q}\pi_Q(X_{\alpha_q}) \rangle\,,$$

where $X_{\alpha_q} \in T_{\alpha_q}T^*Q$, $\alpha_q \in T^*Q$ and $q \in Q$. In canonical bundle coordinates (q^i, p_i) on T^*Q the projection reads $\pi_Q(q^i, p_i) = q^i$, and one finds easily that θ_Q has coordinate expression $\theta_Q = p_i \mathrm{d}q^i$. The 2-form $\omega_Q = -\mathrm{d}\theta_Q$ is a symplectic form on T^*Q whose local expression is

$$\omega_Q = \mathrm{d}q^i \wedge \mathrm{d}p_i\,.$$

Darboux's theorem states that for an arbitrary symplectic manifold (M, ω), there exist local coordinates (q^i, p_i) in a neighbourhood of each point in M such that $\omega = \mathrm{d}q^i \wedge \mathrm{d}p_i$. It follows that all symplectic manifolds are locally isomorphic.

Dirac structures on a vector space. Let V be a n-dimensional vector space and V^* be its dual space. Define the (non-degenerate) symmetric pairing $\ll \cdot, \cdot \gg$ on $V \oplus V^*$ by

$$\ll (v_1, \alpha_1), (v_2, \alpha_2) \gg = \langle \alpha_1, v_2 \rangle + \langle \alpha_2, v_1 \rangle\,,$$

for $(v_1, \alpha_1), (v_2, \alpha_2) \in V \oplus V^*$, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the natural pairing between V^* and V. A *(linear) Dirac structure on* V is a subspace $D \subset V \oplus V^*$ such that $D = D^\perp$, where $D^\perp$ is the orthogonal subspace of D relative to the pairing $\ll \cdot, \cdot \gg$. Note that according to theis definition the condition $D = D^\perp$ implies that $\langle \alpha, v \rangle = 0$ for each $(v, \alpha) \in D$ (see e.g. [Courant, 1990]). The set of Dirac structures on V will be denoted by $\mathfrak{Dir}(V)$.

We will often use the fact that a vector subspace $D \subset V \oplus V^*$ is a Dirac structure on V if and only if it is maximally isotropic with respect to the symmetric pairing $\ll \cdot, \cdot \gg$, or equivalently, $\dim D = n$ and $\ll (v_1, \alpha_1), (v_2, \alpha_2) \gg = 0$ for all (v_1, α_1), (v_2, α_2) in D.

Example 2.1. We have the following three important examples of Dirac structures:

(a) Let F be a subspace of V, the annihilator F° of F is a subspace of V^* defined as follows

$$F^\circ = \{\alpha \in V^* \mid \langle \alpha, v \rangle = 0 \ \text{ for all } \ v \in F\}.$$

It can be easily proved that $D_V = F \oplus F^\circ$ is a Dirac structure on V.

(b) On a presymplectic vector space (V, ω), a Dirac structure is given by

$$D_\omega = \{(v, \alpha) \in V \oplus V^* \mid \alpha = \omega^\flat(v)\},$$

(recall that $\omega^\flat \colon V \to V^*$ is defined by $\omega^\flat(u)(v) = \omega(u, v)$ for all u, v in V).

(c) Assume $\Lambda : V^* \times V^* \to \mathbb{R}$ is a bivector on V. Then $\sharp_\Lambda : V^* \to V$ is defined as $(\sharp_\Lambda(\alpha))\,(\beta) = \Lambda(\beta, \alpha)$, and its graph defines the Dirac structure

$$D_\Lambda = \{(v, \alpha) \in V \oplus V^* \mid v = \sharp_\Lambda(\alpha)\}.$$

The following fundamental result can be found in [Courant, 1990]:

Proposition 2.2. *Let D be a Dirac structure on V. Define the subspace $F_D \subset V$ to be the projection of D on V. Define the 2-form ω_D on F_D by $\omega_D(u, v) = \alpha(v)$ where $u \oplus \alpha \in D$. Then ω_D is a skew form on F_D. Conversely, given a vector space V, a subspace $F \subset V$ and a skew form ω on F,*

$$D_{F,\omega} = \{u \oplus \alpha \mid u \in F,\ \alpha(v) = \omega(u, v) \text{ for all } v \in F\}$$

is the only Dirac structure D on V such that $F_D = F$ and $\omega_D = \omega$.

In other words, a Dirac structure D on V is uniquely determined by a subspace $F_D \subset V$ and a 2-form ω_D. The case $F = V$ is example (b) above.

When a linear map $\varphi \colon V \to W$ between vector spaces is given and we have a Dirac structure D_W on W, it is possible to induce a Dirac structure D_V on V, the *backward of D_W by φ*, denoted by $D_V = \mathcal{B}\varphi(D_W)$. It is defined as follows:

$$D_V = \mathcal{B}\varphi(D_W) = \{(v, \varphi^* w^*) \in V \oplus V^* \mid v \in V,\ w^* \in W^*,\ (\varphi v, w^*) \in D_W\}.$$

In a similar way, if D_V is a Dirac structure on V, we can construct a Dirac structure $D_W = \mathcal{F}\varphi(D_V)$ on W, the *forward of D_V by φ*,

$$D_W = \mathcal{F}\varphi(D_V) = \{(\varphi v, w^*) \in W \oplus W^* \mid v \in V,\ w^* \in W^*,\ (v, \varphi^* w^*) \in D_V\}.$$

One can think of the assignments $\mathcal{B}\varphi$ and $\mathcal{F}\varphi$ as maps between the sets $\mathfrak{Dir}(V)$ and $\mathfrak{Dir}(W)$ (see Diagram 2.1). The following rules hold:

$$\mathcal{F}(\varphi_1 \circ \varphi_2) = \mathcal{F}\varphi_1 \circ \mathcal{F}\varphi_2, \qquad \mathcal{B}(\varphi_1 \circ \varphi_2) = \mathcal{B}\varphi_2 \circ \mathcal{B}\varphi_1.$$

A more detailed exposition of these notions might be found in e.g. [Bursztyn, 2013, Bursztyn and Radko, 2003, Cendra, Ratiu, and Yoshimura, 2017].



Diagram 2.1: Backward and Forward.

Forward and backward categories. Following [Cendra, Ratiu, and Yoshimura, 2017], we now introduce the categories of forward and backward Dirac spaces.

A Dirac space (`DS` for short) is a pair (U, D_U), where U is a vector space and D_U is a Dirac structure on U. First, we define the category `Forw-DS` of *forward Dirac spaces*. Objects are `DS`, and a morphism

$$\varphi^{\mathcal{F}} \colon (U, D_U) \to (V, D_V)$$

is a map $\varphi \colon U \to V$ such that $\mathcal{F}\varphi(D_U) = D_V$. The composition of morphisms is such that $\varphi^{\mathcal{F}} \circ \psi^{\mathcal{F}} = (\varphi \circ \psi)^{\mathcal{F}}$. For each `DS` (V, D_V) the identity morphism is $(1_V)^{\mathcal{F}}$, where $1_V \colon V \to V$ is the identity. The category `Back-DS` of *backward Dirac spaces* is defined analogously: objects are `DS`, and a morphism

$$\varphi^{\mathcal{B}} \colon (U, D_U) \to (V, D_V)$$

is a map $\varphi \colon U \to V$ such that $\mathcal{B}\varphi(D_V) = D_U$. The composition of morphisms is such that $\varphi^{\mathcal{B}} \circ \psi^{\mathcal{B}} = (\varphi \circ \psi)^{\mathcal{B}}$. For each `DS` (V, D_V) the identity morphism is $(1_V)^{\mathcal{B}}$, where $1_V \colon V \to V$ is the identity. Note that this coincides with the identity in `Forw-DS`.

Dirac structures on a manifold. A *Dirac structure* D on a manifold M, is a vector subbundle of the Whitney sum $TM \oplus T^*M$ such that for each $x \in M$, $D_x \subset T_xM \oplus T_x^*M$ is a Dirac structure on the vector space T_xM at each point $x \in M$. A *Dirac manifold* is a manifold M with a Dirac structure D on M.

From Proposition 2.2, we have that a Dirac structure on M yields a distribution $F_{D_x} \subset T_xM$ whose dimension is not necessarily constant, carrying a presymplectic form $\omega_D(x) \colon F_{D_x} \times F_{D_x} \to \mathbb{R}$ for all $x \in M$. The following result is proved in [Dalsmo and van der Schaft, 1999], (see also [Yoshimura and Marsden, 2006]).

Theorem 2.3. *Let M be a manifold, ω be a 2-form on M and F be a regular distribution on M. Define the skew-symmetric bilinear form ω_F on F by restricting ω to $F \times F$. For each $x \in M$, define*

$$D_{\omega_F}(x) = \{(v_x, \alpha_x) \in T_xM \oplus T_x^*M \mid v_x \in F_x,\ \alpha_x(u_x) = \omega_F(x)(v_x, u_x) \text{ for all } u_x \in F_x\}.$$

Then $D_{\omega_F} \subset TM \oplus T^*M$ is a Dirac structure on M. In fact, it is the only Dirac structure D on M satisfying $F_x = F_{D_x}$ and $\omega_F(x) = \omega_D(x)$ for all $x \in M$.

As usual, we have used the terminology *regular distribution* to mean that F has constant rank. Examples of Theorem 2.3 are the case $\omega = 0$ where $D_{\omega_F} = F \oplus F^\circ \subset TM \oplus T^*M$, and the case $F = TM$ where D_ω is the graph of ω.

The dual version of Theorem 2.3 is as follows (see, for instance, [Dalsmo and van der Schaft, 1999]).

Theorem 2.4. *Let M be a manifold and let $B\colon T^*M \times T^*M \to \mathbb{R}$ be a skew-symmetric two-tensor. Given a regular codistribution $F^{(*)} \subset T^*M$ on M, define the skew-symmetric two-tensor $B_{F^{(*)}}$ on $F^{(*)}$ by restricting B to $F^{(*)} \times F^{(*)}$. For each $x \in M$, let*

$$D_{B_{F^{(*)}}}(x) = \left\{(v_x, \alpha_x) \in T_xM \times T_x^*M \mid \alpha_x \in F_x^{(*)},\ \beta_x(v_x) = B_{F^*}(x)(\beta_x, \alpha_x) \text{ for all } \beta_x \in F_x^{(*)}\right\}.$$

Then $D_{B_{F^{(*)}}} \subset TM \oplus T^*M$ is a Dirac structure on M.

As an example, let (M, Λ) be a Poisson manifold where $B = \Lambda\colon T^*M \times T^*M \to \mathbb{R}$. If $F^{(*)} = T^*M$, then the Dirac structure defined in Theorem 2.4 is the graph of the Poisson structure thought as a map from T^*M to TM.

Remark 2.5. It is proved in [Dalsmo and van der Schaft, 1999] that under the assumptions of constant rank of the distributions/codistributions (viz. regularity), Theorems 2.3 and 2.4 describe the only two canonical Dirac structures that can be defined on a manifold, one associated with a presymplectic form and the other one with a two-tensor.

A Dirac structure D on M is called *integrable* if the condition

$$\langle \mathrm{L}_{X_1}\alpha_2, X_3\rangle + \langle \mathrm{L}_{X_2}\alpha_3, X_1\rangle + \langle \mathrm{L}_{X_3}\alpha_1, X_2\rangle = 0$$

is satisfied for all pairs of vector fields and 1-forms (X_1, α_1), (X_2, α_2), (X_3, α_3) in D, where L_X denotes the Lie derivative along the vector field X on M. This definition is linked to the notion of closedness for presymplectic forms and Jacobi identity for brackets. This integrability property provides the following description that was proved in [Courant, 1990].

Theorem 2.6. *If D is an integrable Dirac structure on a manifold M, then the distribution F_D is integrable. In other words, for each $x \in M$ there exists a maximal immersed submanifold S of M such that $x \in S$ and $T_yS = F_{D_y}$ for all $y \in S$ (i.e. S is an integral submanifold of F_D). Each integral submanifold S carries a presymplectic form $\omega_{D,S}$ defined by $\omega_{D,S}(x) = \omega_D(x)$ for each $x \in S$.*

The proof of this result follows essentially from the results in [Hermann, 1962] (see also [Lobry, 1970]).

We now turn to the definition of backward and forward Dirac structures for manifolds in the cases of interest for this work. Let us assume that we have a smooth map $f\colon M \to N$ between two manifolds M and N, and that $D_N \subset TN \oplus T^*N$ is a Dirac structure. At each point $x \in M$, one can use the backward of the map $T_x f$ to construct a subspace on $T_xM \oplus T_x^*M$. This construction pointwise defines a subbundle of $TM \oplus T^*M$ (not necessarily smooth). Whenever it is smooth, it defines a new Dirac structure D_M on M called the backward of D_N by the map Tf, and we write $D_M = \mathcal{B}(Tf)\,(D_N)$. We will use the following results (see e.g. [Bursztyn, 2013, Cendra, Ratiu, and Yoshimura, 2017]):

i) If $T_x f$ is surjective for each $x \in M$, then $D_M = \mathcal{B}(Tf)\,(D_N)$ is a Dirac structure on M.

ii) If $i_M\colon M \hookrightarrow N$ is a submanifold, then $D_M = \mathcal{B}(Ti_M)\,(D_N) = \{(v, \alpha) \in D_N \mid \alpha \in TM^\circ\}$ is a Dirac structure if $D_N \cap (\{0\} \oplus TM^\circ)$ has constant rank (the clean-intersection condition), where $TM^\circ = \{\alpha \in T^*N \mid \alpha(v) = 0,\ \forall v \in TM\}$ is the annihilator.

iii) If D_N is given by the graph of a 2-form ω on N, then $D_M = \mathcal{B}(Tf)\,(D_N)$ is a Dirac structure on M.

Let now $f\colon M \to N$ be a smooth map, and D_M be a Dirac structure on M. When we aim at defining the push-forward, we first need to ask for Tf-invariance of D_M, meaning that

$$\mathcal{F}(T_x f)(D_M(x)) = \mathcal{F}(T_{x'} f)(D_M(x')), \qquad \text{whenever } f(x) = f(x').$$

A sufficient condition to ensure that $\mathcal{F}(Tf)(D_M)$ defines a Dirac structure is the following:

iv) Let $f\colon M \to N$ be a surjective submersion and D_M be a Dirac structure on M. If D_M is Tf-invariant and $\ker(Tf) \cap D_M = \{(v, \alpha) \in D_M \mid v \in \ker(Tf)\}$ has constant rank, then $D_N = \mathcal{F}(Tf)\,(D_M)$ defines a forward Dirac structure.

Remark 2.7. Given a map $f\colon M \to N$, the usual notation in the literature for the backward and forward is $\mathcal{B}(f)$ and $\mathcal{F}(f)$, respectively. However, we will use $\mathcal{B}(Tf)$ and $\mathcal{F}(Tf)$ to avoid confusion because later we will work with vector bundles.

3 Morse families and Dirac systems

The notion of a Morse family or phase function was introduced in [Hörmander, 1971]. Here we just give some key definitions and essential results that we will need later. More details can be found in [Abraham and Marsden, 1978, de León and Rodrigues, 1989, Guillemin and Sternberg, 1977, Libermann and Marle, 1987, Weinstein, 1971] and references therein. In particular, we will follow [Libermann and Marle, 1987].

Morse families and Lagrangian submanifolds. A simple but important example of a Lagrangian submanifold of T^*Q is provided by the image $\alpha(Q)$ of a closed 1-form α on Q, see [Libermann and Marle, 1987]. More general Lagrangian submanifolds of cotangent bundles can be represented as a certain quotient of images of 1-forms, as we will explain next (see [Libermann and Marle, 1987]). Recall that if $\pi\colon M \to N$ is a submersion the conormal bundle is

$$(\ker T\pi)^\circ = \left\{\alpha \in T^*M \mid \langle \alpha, v\rangle = 0, \text{ for all } v \in \ker T_{\pi_M(\alpha)}\pi\right\} \subset T^*M.$$

Define the vector bundle morphism $\mathfrak{j}_\pi\colon (\ker T\pi)^\circ \to T^*N$ by

$$\langle \mathfrak{j}_\pi(\eta), T\pi(v)\rangle = \langle \eta, v\rangle \tag{3.1}$$

for all $\eta \in (\ker T\pi)^\circ$ and for all $v \in T_{\pi(\eta)}M$. It is easy to check that this application is well defined and that the following diagram is commutative

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\ker T\pi)^\circ & \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{j}_\pi} & T^*N \\ {\scriptstyle (\pi_M)|_{(\ker T\pi)^\circ}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi_N} \\ M & \xrightarrow[\pi]{} & N \end{array}$$

One can check using the definition of $\mathfrak{j}_\pi$ (3.1) that the restriction of $\mathfrak{j}_\pi$ to each fiber is an isomorphism from that fiber to the corresponding fiber of T^*N. The map $\mathfrak{j}_\pi$ can be described locally as follows. Let (q^i, y^a) be fibered coordinates on M and (q^i) on N such that $\pi(q^i, y^a) = (q^i)$ which induce coordinates (q^i, y^a, p_i, z_a) on T^*M and (q^i, p_i) on T^*N. The subbundle $(\ker T\pi)^\circ$ is described by coordinates $(q^i, y^a, p_i, 0)$ and

$$\begin{array}{rccc} \mathfrak{j}_\pi : & (\ker T\pi)^\circ & \longrightarrow & T^*N, \\ & (q^i, y^a, p_i, z_a = 0) & \longmapsto & (q^i, p_i). \end{array}$$

We write $\pi^*\colon T^*_{\pi(\eta)}N \to T^*_\eta M$ for the pullback of π. Note that

$$\pi^* \circ \mathfrak{j}_\pi = \mathrm{id}_{(\ker T\pi)^\circ}.$$

Definition 3.1. Let $\pi\colon M \to N$ be a submersion of a differentiable manifold M onto a differentiable manifold N. Let $E\colon M \to \mathbb{R}$ be a differentiable function. The function E is called a *Morse family over the submersion* π if the image of the differential of E, $\mathrm{d}E(M) \subset T^*M$, and the conormal bundle are transverse in T^*M.

Recall that by definition $\mathrm{d}E(M)$ and $(\ker T\pi)^\circ$ are transverse in T^*M, denoted $\mathrm{d}E(M) \pitchfork (\ker T\pi)^\circ$, if

$$\forall \alpha \in (\ker T\pi)^\circ \cap \mathrm{d}E(M) \subset T^*M, \qquad T_\alpha(\mathrm{d}E(M)) + T_\alpha(\ker T\pi)^\circ = T_\alpha(T^*M).$$

In coordinates adapted to the fibration, if the submersion $\pi : M \to N$ is expressed by $\pi(q^i, y^a) = (q^i)$, then the condition for $E : M \to \mathbb{R}$ to be a Morse family is that the matrix

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial q^i \partial y^b}, \frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial y^a \partial y^b}\right) \tag{3.2}$$

has maximal rank for all (q^i, y^a) satisfying $\dfrac{\partial E}{\partial y^a} = 0$.

Observe that as a consequence of Definition 3.1 the submanifold $(\ker T\pi)^\circ \cap \mathrm{d}E(M)$ is isotropic in (T^*M, ω_M), since it is contained in the Lagrangian submanifold $\mathrm{d}E(M)$. A computation shows that $\dim\left((\ker T\pi)^\circ \cap \mathrm{d}E(M)\right) = \dim N$ (see [Libermann and Marle, 1987]). We remark that the restriction of ω_M to $(\ker T\pi)^\circ$ is equal to $\pi^*\omega_N$, locally $\mathrm{d}q^i \wedge \mathrm{d}p_i$. From here we derive the following useful result (see also [Libermann and Marle, 1987, Appendix 7, Proposition 1.12] or Chapter 4 in [Guillemin and Sternberg, 1977]).

Proposition 3.2. *Let $E\colon M \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Morse family. The restriction of the morphism $\mathfrak{j}_\pi\colon (\ker T\pi)^\circ \to T^*N$ to the isotropic submanifold $(\ker T\pi)^\circ \cap \mathrm{d}E(M)$ is a Lagrangian immersion of $(\ker T\pi)^\circ \cap \mathrm{d}E(M)$ in (T^*N, ω_N). This Lagrangian immersion is said to be generated by the Morse family E.*

We will denote by

$$S_E = \mathfrak{j}_\pi\left(\mathrm{d}E(M) \cap (\ker T\pi)^\circ\right)$$

the immersed Lagrangian submanifold in the above proposition. Observe that in general S_E is not horizontal, that is, it is not transverse to the fibers of the canonical cotangent projection π_N, and consequently, it is not the image of the differential of a function on N.

Weak Morse families. Motivated by mechanics, constrained variational principles, interconnected systems and optimal control, we will now describe a certain extension of the basic results on Morse families discussed in the previous paragraphs. Namely we will study cases where we have the weaker condition that $(\ker T\pi)^\circ \cap \mathrm{d}E(M)$ is a submanifold and for all $\alpha \in (\ker T\pi)^\circ \cap \mathrm{d}E(M)$ we have that

$$T_\alpha\big((\ker T\pi)^\circ \cap \mathrm{d}E(M)\big) = T_\alpha(\ker T\pi)^\circ \cap T_\alpha \mathrm{d}E(M)\,.$$

That is, we are assuming $(\ker T\pi)^\circ$ and $\mathrm{d}E(M)$ are weakly transverse (sometimes called clean intersection). Under the condition of weak transversality we have that

$$\mathfrak{j}_\pi|_{(\ker T\pi)^\circ \cap \mathrm{d}E(M)} : (\ker T\pi)^\circ \cap \mathrm{d}E(M) \to T^*N$$

is of constant rank (a subimmersion). With this assumption, $\mathfrak{j}_\pi((\ker T\pi)^\circ \cap \mathrm{d}E(M))$ is an immersed Lagrangian submanifold of T^*N which may include multiple points (see [Libermann and Marle, 1987]).

The local criteria we will be using for weak transversality of $\mathrm{d}E(M)$ is the following. The submanifold $(\ker T\pi)^\circ$ is described locally by $z_a = 0$, $a = 1, \ldots, k$ (where $k = \dim M - \dim N$). Let $z = (z_1, \ldots, z_k)$ be a $\mathbb{R}^k$-valued function. We define the set

$$M_0 = \{m \in M \mid \mathrm{d}E(m) \in (\ker T\pi)^\circ\} \subset M.$$

Locally, M_0 coincides with the set $(z \circ \mathrm{d}E)^{-1}(0)$. The differential of the map $z \circ \mathrm{d}E$ is the matrix (3.2). Therefore, if its rank is constant, using the constant rank theorem the set $(z \circ \mathrm{d}E)^{-1}(0)$ defines an embedded submanifold whose tangent

space is $\operatorname{Im} \mathrm{d}E \cap \ker z$. To sum up, if the matrix in (3.2) has constant rank (not necessarily maximum), $\mathrm{d}E(M_0) = (\ker T\pi)^\circ \cap \mathrm{d}E(M)$ is an embedded submanifold of T^*M whose tangent space satisfies the clean intersection condition.

Definition 3.3. With the notation introduced above, E will be called a *weak Morse family* (weak Morse family) if $(\ker T\pi)^\circ$ and $\mathrm{d}E(M)$ are weakly transverse.

Example 3.4. The following simple example of weak Morse family is of interest in this paper. Given the submersion $\pi : M \to N$ and a function $f : N \to \mathbb{R}$, take $E = \pi^* f : M \to \mathbb{R}$. Obviously E is not a Morse family (the rank of (3.2) is zero), but it is a weak Morse family and moreover

$$\mathfrak{j}_\pi((\ker T\pi)^\circ \cap \mathrm{d}E(M)) = \operatorname{Im} \mathrm{d}f\,,$$

which is a Lagrangian submanifold of (T^*N, ω_N).

Dirac dynamical system. Assume that M is endowed with a Dirac structure D. In the presence of an *energy* function $E\colon M \to \mathbb{R}$, we will consider the following implicit dynamical system: for a curve $\gamma\colon I \to M$ (where $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ is an interval), we say that γ is a solution of the *Dirac system* $(D, \mathrm{d}E)$ if

$$\dot\gamma(t) \oplus \mathrm{d}E\,(\gamma(t)) \in (D_M)_{\gamma(t)} \quad \text{for all } t \in I. \tag{3.3}$$

The system described by (3.3) is general enough to encompass a number of situations of interest in mathematical physics including of course classical Lagrangian and Hamiltonian systems, but also nonholomic mechanics or electric LC circuits.

Dirac system over a Morse family. We will now extend the definition of Dirac system to include more general Lagrangian submanifolds. As the examples in the next section will show, this broader definition permits to describe more general dynamical systems in terms of a Dirac structure and a Lagrangian submanifold.

With the notations above, let $\pi\colon M \to N$ be a surjective submersion, $S_E \subset T^*N$ a Lagrangian submanifold induced by a weak Morse family $E : M \to \mathbb{R}$, and D_N a Dirac structure on N. We look for curves $n(t)$ in N which solve the following implicit dynamical system

$$\dot n(t) \oplus \mu_{n(t)} \in (D_N)_{n(t)} \quad \text{for all } t \in I, \tag{3.4}$$

where $\mu_{n(t)} \in (S_E)_{n(t)}$, meaning that $\mu_{n(t)} \in S_E$ and $\pi_N(\mu_{n(t)}) = n(t)$ (note that$\pi_N\colon T^*N \to N$ is the canonical projection of the cotangent bundle). We will say that the dynamical system (3.4) is a *Dirac system over* E. We will also refer to (3.4) as the *(generalized) Dirac system* (D_N, S_E).

The solution curves of the Dirac system over a Morse family can be alternatively described as a projection of solution curves of the Dirac system $(D_M, \mathrm{d}E)$, where $D_M = \mathcal{B}(T\pi)(D_N)$ is the backward of D_N by π. Remember that the backward Dirac structure D_M is well defined since π is a submersion (see 2 and [Cendra, Ratiu, and Yoshimura, 2017]). More precisely:

Theorem 3.5. *Let I be an interval of $\mathbb{R}$, $E : M \to \mathbb{R}$ be a weak Morse family over the submersion $\pi\colon M \to N$, D_N be a Dirac structure over N, and D_M be the backward Dirac structure on M induced by D_N.*

i) If $m : I \to M$ is a solution of the Dirac system determined by $(D_M, \mathrm{d}E)$, that is, for all t in I

$$\dot{m}(t) \oplus \mathrm{d}E(m(t)) \in (D_M)_{m(t)}\,,$$

then the curve $n : I \to N$ defined by $n = \pi \circ m$ is a solution of the Dirac system determined by (D_N, S_E), that is, for all t in I,

$$\dot{n}(t) \oplus \mu_{n(t)} \in (D_N)_{n(t)}$$

where $\mu_{n(t)} \in (S_E)_{n(t)}$.

ii) Conversely, if $n : I \to N$ is a solution of the Dirac system determined by (D_N, S_E), then any curve $m : I \to M$ such that $m(t) \in \pi_M(\mathrm{d}E(M) \cap (\ker T\pi)^\circ)$ and $n = \pi \circ m$, is a solution of the Dirac system determined by $(D_M, \mathrm{d}E)$.

Proof. Using the definition of D_M, $\dot{m}(t) \oplus \mathrm{d}E(m(t)) \in (D_M)_{m(t)}$, then $\mathrm{d}E(m(t)) \in (\ker T\pi)^\circ|_{m(t)}$ for all $t \in I$. Therefore, for $n = \pi \circ m$

$$\mathfrak{j}_\pi(\mathrm{d}E(m(t))) \in (S_E)_{n(t)}$$

and

$$T\pi(\dot{m}(t)) \oplus \mathfrak{j}_\pi(\mathrm{d}E(m(t))) \in (D_N)_{n(t)}$$

In consequence, if $m : I \to M$ is a solution of the Dirac system determined by $(D_M, \mathrm{d}E)$, then $n = \pi \circ m$ is a solution of the Dirac system determined by (D_N, S_E). The converse is derived using similar arguments. ■

Finally, we remark that the notion of Dirac system over a Morse family includes the case of a standard Dirac system $(D, \mathrm{d}E)$ as follows. If D is a Dirac structure on M, one can consider the identity map on M, $1_M\colon M \to M$, and then the energy E is obviously a Morse function for 1_M. The Dirac system (D, S_E) obtained coincides with the Dirac system $(D, \mathrm{d}E)$.

4 Examples

The purpose of this section is to show how the notion of generalized Dirac system covers many examples of interest in mechanics and control theory.

4.1 Lagrangian and Hamiltonian Mechanics

We will cover this first example in some detail to clarify the notations and basic results of the previous sections.

Lagrangian mechanics. Let $L : TQ \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Lagrangian, possibly degenerate, and consider the Dirac structure D_{ω_Q} on T^*Q induced by the canonical symplectic 2-form ω_Q on T^*Q. The coordinate expression of D_{ω_Q} reads:

$$D_{\omega_Q} = \left\{(q^i, p_i, \dot{q}^i, \dot{p}_i, \alpha_i, \beta^i) \mid \dot{p}_i + \alpha_i = 0,\, \dot{q}^i - \beta^i = 0\right\}.$$

Define the energy function $E : TQ \oplus T^*Q \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$E(q, v_q, \alpha_q) = \langle \alpha_q, v_q \rangle - L(v_q).$$

It is clear that E is a Morse family for the projection $\mathrm{pr}_2 : TQ \oplus T^*Q \to T^*Q$, and therefore it generates the Lagrangian submanifold S_E of T^*T^*Q. Indeed, the local expressions for the projection and the energy are $\mathrm{pr}_2(q^i, v^i, p_i) = (q^i, p_i)$ and $E(q^i, v^i, p_i) = p_i v^i - L(q^i, v^i)$, and the matrix

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial q^i \partial v^j}, \frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial p_i \partial v^j}, \frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial v^i \partial v^j}\right)_{\{i,j\}} = \left(-\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial q^i \partial v^j}, \mathbb{I}, -\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial v^i \partial v^j}\right)_{\{i,j\}}$$

has maximal rank ($\mathbb{I}$ denotes de identity matrix of dimension equal to $\dim Q$). We will also need the kernel of $T\mathrm{pr}_2$ and its annihilator,

$$\begin{aligned} \ker(T\mathrm{pr}_2) &= \left\{(q^i, v^i, p_i, \dot{q}^i, \dot{v}^i, \dot{p}_i) \mid \dot{q}^i = \dot{p}_i = 0\right\} \subset T(TQ \oplus T^*Q), \\ (\ker(T\mathrm{pr}_2))^\circ &= \left\{(q^i, v^i, p_i, \alpha_i, \gamma_i, \beta^i) \,\middle|\, \gamma_i = 0\right\} \subset T^*(TQ \oplus T^*Q). \end{aligned}$$

The local expression of the map $\mathfrak{j}_\pi \colon (\ker(T\mathrm{pr}_2))^\circ \to T^*T^*Q$ is then

$$\mathfrak{j}_\pi(q^i, v^i, p_i, \alpha_i, \gamma_i = 0, \beta^i) = (q^i, p_i, \alpha_i, \beta^i),$$

and from here the expression of $S_E = \mathfrak{j}_\pi\left(\mathrm{d}E(M) \cap \left(\ker(T\mathrm{pr}_2)\right)^\circ\right)$ follows:

$$\begin{aligned} S_E &= \mathfrak{j}_\pi\left(\left\{\left(q^i, v^i, p_i, -\frac{\partial L}{\partial q^i}, p_i - \frac{\partial L}{\partial v^i}, v^i\right)\right\} \cap \left(\ker(T\mathrm{pr}_2)\right)^\circ\right) \\ &= \left\{\left(q^i, p_i, -\frac{\partial L}{\partial q^i}, v^i\right) \,\middle|\, p_i = \frac{\partial L}{\partial v^i}\right\} \subset T^*T^*Q. \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

To get dynamics, we consider the generalized Dirac system determined by the pair (D_{ω_Q}, S_E). Recall that a curve $\gamma \colon I \to T^*Q$ is a solution of this implicit system if is satisfies:

$$(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t)) \oplus \mu_{\gamma(t)} \in (D_{\omega_Q})_{\gamma(t)} \quad \text{for all } t \in I,$$

where $\mu_{\gamma(t)} \in (S_E)_{\gamma(t)}$. In coordinates, $\gamma(t) = (q^i(t), p_i(t))$ and a solution satisfies

$$\frac{dq^i}{dt} = v^i, \qquad \frac{dp_i}{dt} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial q^i}, \qquad p_i - \frac{\partial L}{\partial v^i} = 0.$$

Expressed in more familiar terms,

$$\frac{dq^i}{dt} = v^i, \qquad \frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial v^i}\right) = \frac{\partial L}{\partial q^i},$$

which are the well-known Euler-Lagrange equations for L.

Hamiltonian mechanics. Consider a Hamiltonian $H\colon T^*Q \to \mathbb{R}$ and the Dirac structure D_{ω_Q} on T^*Q. It is immediate to check that the Dirac system on T^*Q with energy $E = H$ given by

$$(\dot{q}, \dot{p}) \oplus \mathrm{d}E \in D_{\omega_Q},$$

leads to the classical Hamilton equations

$$\dot{q} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p}(q,p), \qquad \dot{p} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q}(q,p).$$

The Pontryagin bundle as phase space. From Theorem 3.5, we can alternatively consider the canonical Dirac structure D_M on $M = TQ \oplus T^*Q$ defined by the pullback of the canonical symplectic form on $N = T^*Q$ by the canonical projection $\mathrm{pr}_2\colon M \to T^*Q$ (see (A.2)). For the Lagrangian case, we take the usual energy on M, $E(q,v,p) = pv - L(q,v)$. A curve $(q(t), v(t), p(t))$ is a solution of the Dirac system $(D_M, \mathrm{d}E)$ if it satisfies the implicit Euler-Lagrange equations obtained above.

Remark 4.1. More details about the Dirac structure D_{ω_Q} and its relation with the geometry of the spaces TT^*Q, T^*T^*Q and T^*TQ can be found in Appendix A.

4.2 Mechanics on linear almost Poisson structures

Let $\tau_{\mathcal{A}}\colon \mathcal{A} \to Q$ be a vector bundle of rank n over a manifold Q of dimension m, and let $\mathcal{A}^*$ be the dual vector bundle of $\mathcal{A}$, with corresponding vector bundle projection $\pi_{\mathcal{A}^*}\colon \mathcal{A}^* \to Q$. Recall that a *linear almost Poisson structure* on $\mathcal{A}^*$ is a bracket

$$\{\cdot,\cdot\}_{\mathcal{A}^*}\colon C^\infty(\mathcal{A}^*) \times C^\infty(\mathcal{A}^*) \to C^\infty(\mathcal{A}^*)$$

such that

i) $\{\cdot,\cdot\}_{\mathcal{A}^*}$ is skew-symmetric, that is,

$$\{\varphi,\psi\}_{\mathcal{A}^*} = -\{\psi,\varphi\}_{\mathcal{A}^*}, \qquad \text{for } \varphi,\psi \in C^\infty(\mathcal{A}^*).$$

ii) $\{\cdot,\cdot\}_{\mathcal{A}^*}$ satisfies the Leibniz rule, that is,

$$\{\varphi\varphi',\psi\}_{\mathcal{A}^*} = \varphi\{\varphi',\psi\}_{\mathcal{A}^*} + \varphi'\{\varphi,\psi\}_{\mathcal{A}^*}, \qquad \text{for } \varphi,\varphi',\psi \in C^\infty(\mathcal{A}^*).$$

iii) $\{\cdot,\cdot\}_{\mathcal{A}^*}$ is linear, which by definition means that if φ and ψ are linear functions on $\mathcal{A}^*$ then $\{\varphi,\psi\}_{\mathcal{A}^*}$ is also a linear function.

If, in addition, the bracket satisfies the Jacobi identity then $\{\cdot,\cdot\}_{\mathcal{A}^*}$ is called a *linear Poisson structure* on $\mathcal{A}^*$. We will denote by $\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}^*}(df,dg) = \{f,g\}_{\mathcal{A}^*}$ the (almost) Poisson bivector associated to an (almost) Poisson linear structure. The associated Dirac structure will be denoted $D_{\mathcal{A}^*} \subset T\mathcal{A}^* \oplus T^*\mathcal{A}^*$.

The local description of such a bracket is as follows. Let (q^i), $1 \le i \le n$ be local coordinates on an open subset U of Q and $\{e^A\}$, $1 \le A \le \operatorname{rank}\mathcal{A}^*$ be a local basis of sections of $\pi_{\mathcal{A}^*}\colon \mathcal{A}^* \to Q$. Any point $\alpha_q \in \mathcal{A}^*$ is locally given by $\alpha_q = p_A e^A(q)$

and, therefore, (q^i, p_A) provide coordinates on $\mathcal{A}^*$. With respect to this system of coordinates on $\mathcal{A}^*$, the linear almost Poisson bracket have the following local expressions:

$$\{p_A, p_B\}_{\mathcal{A}^*} = -\mathcal{C}^D_{AB} p_D, \qquad \{q^j, p_A\}_{\mathcal{A}^*} = \rho^j_A, \qquad \{q^i, q^j\}_{\mathcal{A}^*} = 0,$$

with C^D_{AB} and ρ^j_A real C^∞-functions on U. Consequently, the linear almost Poisson bivector associated to the linear almost Poisson structure on $\mathcal{A}^*$ has the following coordinate expression:

$$\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}^*} = \rho^j_A \frac{\partial}{\partial q^j} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial p_A} - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{C}^D_{AB} p_D \frac{\partial}{\partial p_A} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial p_B}.$$

We remark that this example generalizes the case $\mathcal{A} = TQ$, where the Poisson bivector Λ_{T^*Q} is the canonical one associated to the canonical symplectic form. Note that both ω_Q and Λ_{T^*Q} define the same Dirac structure on T^*Q.

Equations of motion. We specify the dynamics giving a Lagrangian function $L : \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{R}$ with associated energy function $E \colon M \to \mathbb{R}$, with $M = \mathcal{A} \oplus \mathcal{A}^*$,

$$\begin{array}{rccl} E: & \mathcal{A} \oplus \mathcal{A}^* & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{R} \\ & (v_q, \alpha_q) & \longmapsto & \langle \alpha_q, v_q \rangle - L(v_q), \end{array}$$

which is a Morse family over the submersion $\pi_{(M,\mathcal{A}^*)} \colon M \to \mathcal{A}^*$. This Morse family generates the immersed Lagrangian submanifold S_E of the symplectic manifold $(T^*\mathcal{A}^*, \omega_{\mathcal{A}^*})$. A curve $\gamma \colon I \subset \mathbb{R} \to \mathcal{A}^*$ is a solution of generalized Dirac system $(D_{\mathcal{A}^*}, S_E)$ if it satisfies

$$(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t)) \oplus \mu_{\gamma(t)} \in (D_{\mathcal{A}^*})_{\gamma(t)} \quad t \in I.$$

Taking coordinates (q^i, v^A) on $\mathcal{A}$ induced by the dual basis $\{e_A\}$ of $\{e^A\}$ we have coordinates (q^i, v^A, p_A) on $\mathcal{A} \oplus \mathcal{A}^*$. Then $\mathrm{pr}_2(q^i, v^A, p_A) = (q^i, p_A)$, $E(q^i, v^A, p_A) = p_A v^A - L(q^i, v^A)$, and by a computation completely analogous to the one used to obtain (4.1), we find:

$$S_E = \left\{ (q^i, p_A, \alpha_i, \beta^A) \in T^*\mathcal{A}^* \;\middle|\; \alpha_i = -\frac{\partial L}{\partial q^i},\ \beta^A = v^A,\ p_A - \frac{\partial L}{\partial v^A} = 0 \right\}.$$

Note that, in general, S_E will not be the graph of the differential of a real function on $\mathcal{A}^*$ (but it is an immersed Lagrangian submanifold, as shown in Section 3). If the Lagrangian is regular, then S_E can be obtained as a differential.

The expression of $D_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}^*}} \subset T\mathcal{A}^* \oplus T^*\mathcal{A}^*$ is obtained as the graph of the bivector $\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}^*}$:

$$D_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}^*}} = \{(q^i, p_A, \dot{q}^i, \dot{p}_A, \alpha_i, \beta^A) \mid \dot{q}^i = \rho^i_A \beta^A,\ \dot{p}_A = -\rho^i_A \alpha_i - C^D_{AB} p_D \beta^B\}.$$

From here, the equations of motion will follow from the generalized Dirac system $(D_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}^*}}, S_E)$. In coordinates, a curve solves the Dirac system $(D_{\mathcal{A}^*}, S_E)$ if, and only if,

$$\dot{q}^i = \rho^i_A v^A, \qquad \dot{p}_A = \rho^j_A \frac{\partial L}{\partial q^j} - C^D_{AB} p_D v^B, \qquad p_A - \frac{\partial L}{\partial v^A} = 0.$$

For the Hamiltonian description, the energy E is given by the Hamiltonian $H(q,p)$, and the Dirac system $(D_{\mathcal{A}^*}, \mathrm{d}E)$ leads to:

$$\dot{q}^i = \rho^i_A v^A, \qquad \dot{p}_A = -\rho^j_A \frac{\partial H}{\partial q^j} - C^D_{AB} p_D \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_B},$$

which agree with those in the literature, see [de León, Marrero, and Martín de Diego, 2010].

Remark 4.2. More details on the geometry of $D_{\mathcal{A}}$ can be found in Appendix B.

Euler-Poincaré equations (see e.g. [Holm, 2011, Marsden and Ratiu, 1999]). A particular case of the previous construction is obtained when $\mathcal{A}^*$ is the dual of a Lie algebra (as a vector bundle over a point). Let G be a Lie group, $\mathfrak{g}$ its Lie algebra and $\mathfrak{g}^*$ its dual. On $\mathfrak{g}^*$ we have the $\pm$ Lie-Poisson bracket:

$$\{f,g\}_{\pm}(\mu) = \pm \left\langle \mu, \left[\frac{\delta f}{\delta \mu}, \frac{\delta g}{\delta \mu}\right] \right\rangle,$$

where $\mu \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ and $\frac{\delta f}{\delta \mu} : \mathfrak{g}^* \to \mathfrak{g}$ stands for the functional derivative of f and where $[\,,\,]$ is the Lie algebra bracket on $\mathfrak{g}$. It is well known that both brackets are induced by reduction of the standard Lie bracket on T^*G by right or left-reduction. Let us denote by $\mathfrak{g}^{\pm}$ the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ endowed with the $(\pm)$-Lie-Poisson bracket. The map $\sharp_{\mathfrak{g}^{\pm}}$ is simply

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \sharp_{\mathfrak{g}^{\pm}} : T^*\mathfrak{g}^* \equiv \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g} & \longrightarrow & T\mathfrak{g}^* \equiv \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^* \\ (\mu, \xi) & \longmapsto & (\mu, \mp ad^*_\xi \mu), \end{array}$$

and we have a Dirac structure defined on $\mathfrak{g}^*$, $D_{\mathfrak{g}^{\pm}} \subset T\mathfrak{g}^* \oplus T^*\mathfrak{g}^* \equiv \mathfrak{g}^* \oplus \mathfrak{g}^* \oplus \mathfrak{g}$. Given a Lagrangian $L : \mathfrak{g} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$, frequently defined as a reduced Lagrangian from TG, we have the Morse family

$$\begin{array}{rcl} E : \mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{g}^* & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{R} \\ (\xi, \mu) & \longmapsto & \langle \mu, \xi \rangle - L(\xi), \end{array}$$

generating the Lagrangian submanifold S_E of $T^*\mathfrak{g}^* \equiv \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}$ given by

$$S_E = \left\{ (\mu, \xi) \in \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g} \;\middle|\; \mu = \frac{\delta L}{\delta \xi} \right\}.$$

The solutions of the generalized Dirac system $(D_{\mathfrak{g}^{\pm}}, S_E)$ are curves $\mu : I \subset \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$ such that

$$(\mu(t), \dot{\mu}(t), \xi(t)) \in (D_{\mathfrak{g}^{\pm}})_{\mu(t)} \quad \text{for all } t \in I,$$

where $(\mu(t), \xi(t)) \in S_E$. Therefore, the equations are:

$$\frac{d\mu}{dt} = \mp ad^*_\xi \mu, \quad \mu = \frac{\delta L}{\delta \xi},$$

which correspond to the Euler-Poincaré equations:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{\delta L}{\delta \xi}\right) = \mp ad^*_\xi \frac{\delta L}{\delta \xi}\,.$$

Euler-Poincaré equations with advected parameters. Another important class of examples comes from actions of Lie algebras on manifolds. Given a homomorphism Φ from the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ to the Lie algebra of vector fields on Q, $\mathfrak{X}(Q)$, we can induce a linear Poisson bracket on the trivial bundle $\mathcal{A}^* = Q \times \mathfrak{g}^* \to Q$ given as follows:

$$\{f,g\}_{\mathcal{A}^*} = -\left\langle \mu, \left[\frac{\delta f}{\delta \mu}, \frac{\delta g}{\delta \mu}\right]\right\rangle + dg_q\left(\Phi\left(\frac{\delta f}{\delta \mu}\right)\right) - df_q\left(\Phi\left(\frac{\delta g}{\delta \mu}\right)\right)$$

where $d_q f$ stands for the differential of f with respect to $q \in Q$, and the evaluation point (q,μ) has been suppressed. It is not difficult to check that

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \sharp_{\mathcal{A}^*} : T^*(Q\times\mathfrak{g}^*) \equiv T^*Q\times\mathfrak{g}^*\times\mathfrak{g} & \longrightarrow & T(Q\times\mathfrak{g}^*) \equiv TQ\times\mathfrak{g}^*\times\mathfrak{g}^* \\ (\alpha_q,\mu,\xi) & \longmapsto & (-\Phi(\xi)_q, \mu, ad^*_\xi\mu + \mathbf{J}(\alpha_q)), \end{array}$$

where $\mathbf{J} : T^*Q \to \mathfrak{g}^*$ is the associated cotangent momentum map $\langle \mathbf{J}(\alpha_q), \xi\rangle = \langle \alpha_q, \Phi(\xi)_q\rangle$.

For a Lagrangian $L : \mathcal{A} = Q\times\mathfrak{g} \to \mathbb{R}$ we define the Morse family $E : Q\times\mathfrak{g}\times\mathfrak{g}^* \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $E(q,\xi,\mu) = \langle \mu,\xi\rangle - L(\xi)$ which generates the following Lagrangian submanifold S_E of $T^*(Q\times\mathfrak{g}^*) = T^*Q\times\mathfrak{g}^*\times\mathfrak{g}$

$$S_E = \left\{ (\alpha,\mu,\xi) \in T^*Q\times\mathfrak{g}^*\times\mathfrak{g} \;\middle|\; \alpha = \frac{\delta L}{\delta q},\ \mu = \frac{\delta L}{\delta \xi}\right\}.$$

The equations of motion are derived now using the generalized Dirac system $(D_{\mathcal{A}^*}, S_E)$ and the corresponding solutions are curves $(q,\mu) : I \subset \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow Q\times\mathfrak{g}^*$ such that

$$(q(t),\mu(t),\dot{q}(t),\dot{\mu}(t),\xi(t)) \in (D_{\mathcal{A}^*})_{\{q(t),\mu(t)\}} \quad \forall t \in I,$$

where $(q(t),\mu(t),\xi(t)) \in S_E$. Therefore, the equations are:

$$\frac{dq}{dt} = -\Phi(\xi(q)), \quad \frac{d\mu}{dt} = ad^*_\xi\mu - \mathbf{J}(\alpha), \quad \mu = \frac{\delta L}{\delta\xi}, \quad \alpha = \frac{\delta L}{\delta q},$$

which corresponds to the following equations

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{\delta L}{\delta\xi}\right) = ad^*_\xi\frac{\delta L}{\delta\xi} + \mathbf{J}\left(\frac{\delta L}{\delta q}\right), \quad \frac{dq}{dt} = -\Phi(\xi(q)).$$

As a particular case, suppose that G is a Lie group acting by left representation on a vector space V, and denote by $v \to gv$ the left representation of $g \in G$ on $v \in V$. Then, G also acts on the left on its dual space V^*. For each $v \in V$, denote by $\rho_v : \mathfrak{g} \to V$ the linear map given by

$$\rho_v(\xi) = \left.\frac{d}{dt}\right|_{t=0} \exp(\xi t)v,$$

and denote by $\rho_v^* : V^* \to \mathfrak{g}^*$ the map

$$\langle \rho_v^*(a),\xi\rangle = \langle a, \rho_v(\xi)\rangle, \quad a \in V^*\ ,\ \xi \in \mathfrak{g}.$$

We will use the common notation

$$\rho_v^* a = v \diamond a \in \mathfrak{g}^*.$$

Particularizing the previous discussion to this case, we obtain that $\mathcal{A} = V^* \times \mathfrak{g} \to V^*$ where now the homomorphism $\Phi : \mathfrak{g} \to \text{End}\,(V^*)$, is given by

$$\langle \Phi(\xi)a, v\rangle = \langle v \diamond a, \xi\rangle.$$

In this case $\mathcal{A}^* = V^* \times \mathfrak{g}^* \to V^*$ and the linear Poisson structure is given by

$$\begin{array}{rccl} \sharp_{\mathcal{A}^*} : V^* \times V \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g} & \longrightarrow & V^* \times V^* \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^* \\ (a, v, \mu, \xi) & \longmapsto & (a, -\Phi(\xi)a, v \diamond a, \mu, ad_\xi^*\mu + v \diamond a). \end{array}$$

Given a Lagrangian $L : V^* \times \mathfrak{g} \to \mathbb{R}$ we obtain the Euler-Poincaré equations with advected parameters

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{\delta L}{\delta \xi}\right) = ad_\xi^* \frac{\delta L}{\delta \xi} + \left(\frac{\delta L}{\delta a} \diamond a\right), \quad \frac{da}{dt} = -\Phi(\xi)a.$$

We refer the reader to [Holm, Marsden, and Ratiu, 1998] for many interesting applications of these equations. See also [Cendra and Marsden, 1987] and [Cendra, Ibort, and Marsden, 1987] for a discussion of variational principles in this context.

Nonholonomic mechanics. Now , we will show that the formalism described in Section 4.2 also covers some interesting cases of nonholonomic mechanics (see [Bloch, 2015] and references therein). This particular type of constrained mechanical systems have a considerable practical interest since nonholonomic constraints are present in a great variety of engineering and robotics devices describing the dynamics of wheeled vehicles, manipulation devices and locomotion, etc. For simplicity and since most examples are in the category, we will only consider systems subjected to linear constraints. In this case, the dynamics is described by a C^∞-distribution $\mathcal{A}$ on the configuration space Q or, in a equivalent way, by a linear vector subbundle $\tau_{\mathcal{A}}\colon \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{R}$ of TQ with canonical inclusion $i_{\mathcal{A}}\colon \mathcal{A} \to TQ$. We say that $\mathcal{A}$ is holonomic if $\mathcal{A}$ is integrable or involutive and nonholonomic otherwise, that is, a regular linear velocity constraint $\mathcal{A}$ is nonholonomic if it is not holonomic. Therefore, we will say that a curve $\gamma\colon I \subseteq \mathbb{R} \to Q$ satisfies the constraints given by $\mathcal{A}$ if

$$\dot{\gamma}(t) = \frac{d\gamma}{dt}(t) \in \mathcal{A}_{\gamma(t)} = \tau_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}(\gamma(t)) \ .$$

Mathematically a mechanical nonholonomic system is given by the following data:

1) The Lagrangian $L\colon TQ \to \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$L(v_q) = \frac{1}{2}g(v_q, v_q) - V(q), \quad v_q \in T_qQ.$$

Here g denotes a riemannian metric on the configuration space Q and $V\colon Q \to \mathbb{R}$ is a potential function. Locally, the metric is determined by the non-degenerate symmetric matrix $M = (g_{ij})_{1\leq i,j\leq m=\dim Q}$ such that $g = g_{ij}(q)\, dq^i \otimes dq^j$. Therefore

$$L(q^i, \dot{q}^i) = \frac{1}{2} g_{ij}\dot{q}^i\dot{q}^j - V(q).$$

2) The vector subbundle $\tau_{\mathcal{A}}\colon \mathcal{A} \to Q$.

Given this two data, in nonholonomic mechanics, the equations of motion are completely determined by the Lagrange-d'Alembert principle. This principle states that a curve $\gamma\colon I \subseteq \mathbb{R} \to Q$ is an admissible motion of the system if

$$\delta \int_0^T L(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t))\, dt = 0$$

for variations which satisfy $\delta\gamma \in \mathcal{A}_{\gamma(t)}$. Locally, if $\gamma(t) = q^i(t)$ then, from the Lagrange-d'Alembert principle, we arrive at the well-known nonholonomic equations

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}^i}\right) - \frac{\partial L}{\partial q^i} &= \lambda_\alpha \mu_i^\alpha, \\ \mu_i^\alpha \dot{q}^i &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{A}^0 = \operatorname{span}\{\mu_i^\alpha\, dq^i, 1 \leq \alpha \leq \operatorname{rank}\mathcal{A}\}$.

Now, we will present the previous nonholonomic equation in a way that it is possible to apply directly our formalism of generalized Dirac systems (see [Grabowski, de León, Marrero, and Martín de Diego, 2009, de León, Marrero, and Martín de Diego, 2010]). Using the Riemannian metric g we have the orthogonal decomposition $TQ = \mathcal{A} \oplus \mathcal{A}^\perp$ and the corresponding orthogonal projectors

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{P}\colon TQ \to \mathcal{A}, \\ &\mathcal{Q}\colon TQ \to \mathcal{A}^\perp. \end{aligned}$$

Locally, consider a basis of vector fields $\{X_a, X_\alpha\}$, $1 \leq a \leq m$ and $m+1 \leq \alpha \leq n$, such that

$$\mathcal{A}_q = \operatorname{span}\,\{X_a(q)\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}_q^\perp = \operatorname{span}\,\{X_\alpha(q)\}.$$

Using this decomposition it is easy to induce coordinates (x^i, y^a) in $\mathcal{A}$ such that for any vector $v_q \in T_qQ$

$$v_q = y^a X_a(q) + y^\alpha X_\alpha(q).$$

These coordinates are known as quasi-velocities with respect to the frame $\{X_a, X_\alpha\}$, and they turn out to be very useful in the context of nonholonomic mechanics (we refer the reader to [Crampin and Mestdag, 2010] for more details; see also [Bloch, Marsden, and Zenkov, 2009]). Observe that in these coordinates, if $v_q \in \mathcal{A}_q$, then $y^\alpha = 0$ represents the nonholonomic constraints. Consequently, $\mathcal{A}$ is described by

the coordinates (q^i, y^a). In these adapted coordinates the nonholonomic equations are rewritten as:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{\partial l}{\partial y^a}\right) + \mathcal{C}^c_{ab} y^b \frac{\partial l}{\partial y^c} - X^i_a \frac{\partial l}{\partial q^i} = 0,$$
$$\dot{q}^i = X^i_a(q) y^a,$$

where $X_a = X^i_a(q)\frac{\partial}{\partial q^i}$, $\mathcal{P}[X_a, X_b] = \mathcal{C}^c_{ab} X_c$ and $l\colon \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{R}$ is the restriction of L to $\mathcal{A}$, that is, $L_{|\mathcal{A}} = l$.

Now define the following linear almost Poisson bracket $\{\cdot,\cdot\}_{\mathcal{A}^*}$ on $\mathcal{A}^*$ by:

$$\{f, g\}_{\mathcal{A}^*} = \{f \circ i^*_{\mathcal{A}}, g \circ i^*_{\mathcal{A}}\}_{T^*Q} \circ \mathcal{P}^*,$$

where $i_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{A} \to TQ$ denotes the inclusion, $\{\cdot,\cdot\}_{T^*Q}$ is the standard Poisson bracket of the cotangent bundle and $f, g \in C^\infty(\mathcal{A}^*)$. Denote by $\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}^*}(df, dg) = \{f, g\}_{\mathcal{A}^*}$, and by $D_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}^*}}$ the associated Dirac structure on this almost Poisson manifold (see [de León, Marrero, and Martín de Diego, 2010], and also [van der Schaft and Maschke, 1994, Cantrijn, de León, and Martín de Diego, 1999]). Defining $E : \mathcal{A} \oplus A^* \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$E(v_q, \alpha_q) = \langle \alpha_q, v_q \rangle - l(v_q).$$

the solutions of the nonholonomic equations are expressed as the solutions of the generalized Dirac system determined by $(D_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}^*}}, \mathrm{d}E)$.

4.3 Constrained variational calculus on linear almost Poisson manifolds

Let $L : M \to \mathbb{R}$ be a constrained Lagrangian where $M \subset TQ$ is a constraint submanifold. A constrained variational problem [Arnold, Kozlov, and Neĭshtadt, 1988], [Cortés, de León, Martín de Diego, and Martínez, 2002], [Iglesias, Marrero, Martín de Diego, and Sosa, 2008] consists on finding critical points of an action functional

$$\int_{t_0}^{t_1} L(q(t), \dot{q}(t))\mathrm{d}t$$

on the family of curves satisfying some fixed endpoints condition as, for instance, $q(t_0) = q_0$, $q(t_1) = q_1$ and on the space of curves satisfying the constraints, that is, $(q(t), \dot{q}(t)) \in M_{q(t)}$, for all $t \in (t_0, t_1)$. The submanifold M is $(2n-m)-$dimensional and is locally determined by the vanishing of constraint functions, $\Phi^a = 0$, $1 \leq a \leq m$, where $\Phi^a : TQ \to \mathbb{R}$.

We are implicitly assuming that the solution curves $q(t)$ admit nontrivial variations in the space of curves satisfying the constraints; that is, we are dealing with normal solutions, in opposition to the *abnormal* ones, which are pathological curves that do not admit nontrivial variations.

In the case of normal solutions it is possible to characterize the solutions by using the standard procedure of Lagrange multipliers. The usual way to present the equations of motion of vakonomic mechanics is the following:

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{d}{dt}\left(\dfrac{\partial \tilde{L}}{\partial \dot{q}^i}\right) - \dfrac{\partial \tilde{L}}{\partial q^i} = \dot{\lambda}_a \dfrac{\partial \Phi^a}{\partial \dot{q}^i} + \lambda_a \left[\dfrac{d}{dt}\left(\dfrac{\partial \Phi^a}{\partial \dot{q}^i}\right) - \dfrac{\partial \Phi^a}{\partial q^i}\right], \\ \\ \Phi^a(q,\dot{q}) = 0, \ 1 \leq a \leq m\,, \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

where λ_a are Lagrange multipliers to be determined and $\tilde{L} : TQ \to \mathbb{R}$ is an arbitrary extension of L to TQ. The equations (4.2) can be seen as the Euler-Lagrange equations for the extended Lagrangian $\mathcal{L} = \tilde{L} + \lambda_a \Phi^a$. Note that if we consider the extended Lagrangian $\lambda_0 \tilde{L} + \lambda_a \Phi^a$, with $\lambda_0 = 0$ or 1, then we recover all the solutions, both the normal and the abnormal ones [Arnold, Kozlov, and Neĭshtadt, 1988].

We will see how our scheme is easily adapted to the case of constrained variational problems. Assume, for sake of simplicity, that the restriction $(\tau_Q)_{|M} : M \to Q$ is a surjective submersion. In this case, we can choose coordinates $(q^i, \dot{q}^A)$ on M and the constraints are rewritten $\Phi^a(q^i, \dot{q}^i) = \varphi^a(q^i, \dot{q}^A) - \dot{q}^a$. In other words, M admits the local description:

$$M = \{(q^i, \dot{q}^A, \dot{q}^a) |\ \dot{q}^a = \varphi^a(q^i, \dot{q}^A)\}\,.$$

Given the Lagrangian $L : M \to \mathbb{R}$, define the function $E : M \times_Q T^*Q \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$E(v_q, \alpha_q) = \langle \alpha_q, v_q \rangle - L(v_q)$$

where $v_q \in M_q$ and $\alpha_q \in T^*_qQ$. In adapted coordinates

$$E(q^i, \dot{q}^A, p_i) = \langle p_A, \dot{q}^A \rangle + \langle p_a, \varphi^a(q^i, \dot{q}^A) \rangle - L(q^i, \dot{q}^A)\,.$$

It is a simple computation to show that E is a Morse family for the projection $\mathrm{pr}_2 : M \times_Q T^*Q \to T^*Q$, and it generates the following immersed Lagrangian submanifold S_E of T^*T^*Q:

$$\begin{aligned} S_E &= \left\{ (q^i, p_i, \alpha_i, \beta^i) \in T^*T^*Q \;\middle|\; \alpha_i = \frac{\partial E}{\partial q^i},\ \beta^i = \frac{\partial E}{\partial p_i},\ \frac{\partial E}{\partial v^A} = 0 \right\} \\ &= \left\{ (q^i, p_i, \alpha_i, \beta^i) \in T^*T^*Q \;\middle|\; \alpha_i = -\frac{\partial L}{\partial q^i} + p_a \frac{\partial \varphi^a}{\partial q^i},\ \beta^A = v^A,\ \beta^a = \varphi^a(q^i, \dot{q}^A)\,, \right. \\ &\qquad \left. p_A + p_a \frac{\partial \varphi^a}{\partial v^A} - \frac{\partial L}{\partial v^A} = 0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

If we consider the Dirac structure D_{ω_Q} on T^*Q, then a curve $\gamma(t) = (q^i(t), p_i(t))$ is a solution of the Dirac system (D_{ω_Q}, S_E) if

$$\frac{dq^A}{dt} = v^A, \quad \frac{dq^a}{dt} = \varphi^a(q^i, \dot{q}^A), \quad \frac{dp_i}{dt} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial q^i}, \quad p_A = \frac{\partial L}{\partial v^A} - p_a \frac{\partial \varphi^a}{\partial v^A}.$$

In other terms,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dq^i}{dt} &= v^i, \\
\frac{dq^a}{dt} &= \varphi^a(q^i, \dot{q}^A), \\
\frac{dp_a}{dt} &= \frac{\partial L}{\partial q^a} - p_b \frac{\partial \varphi^b}{\partial q^a}, \\
\frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial v^A} - p_a \frac{\partial \varphi^a}{\partial v^A}\right) &= \frac{\partial L}{\partial q^i} - p_a \frac{\partial \varphi^a}{\partial q^A}.
\end{aligned}$$

These equations are equivalent to the equations (4.2), where $\Psi^a(q^i, \dot{q}^i) = \varphi^a(q^i, \dot{q}^A) - \dot{q}^a$ and $\lambda_a = \frac{\partial L}{\partial q^a} - p_a$. Note that applying Theorem 3.5, one can obtain these equations as a Dirac system on $M \times_Q T^*Q$ for the energy E given above.

The case of a general vector bundle. The same procedure works in the case of reduced constrained systems where we have a Dirac structure on a linear almost Poisson manifold $\mathcal{A}^*$, denoted $D_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}^*}}$, as discussed earlier in Section 4.2. Moreover on the vector bundle $\tau_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{A} \to Q$ we have a fiber bundle $\tau_M : M \to Q$ where $M \subset \mathcal{A}$ (in general, it is not a vector subbundle) and a Lagrangian $L : M \to \mathbb{R}$ (see [Iglesias, Marrero, Martín de Diego, and Sosa, 2008] and references therein).

With the notation used above, let pr_2 denote the projection

$$\mathrm{pr}_2 : M \times_Q \mathcal{A}^* \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}^*,$$

and take as a Morse family

$$\begin{aligned}
E : \quad M \times_Q \mathcal{A}^* &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R}, \\
(v_q, \alpha_q) &\longmapsto \langle \alpha_q, v_q \rangle - L(v_q),
\end{aligned}$$

where $v_q \in M_q$ and $\alpha_q \in \mathcal{A}^*_q$. The equations corresponding to the generalized Dirac system determined by the pair $(D_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}^*}}, S_E)$ are:

$$(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t)) \oplus \mu_{\gamma(t)} \in (D_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}^*}})_{\gamma(t)} \quad t \in I,$$

where $\mu_{\gamma(t)} \in (S_E)_{\gamma(t)}$. In order to write locally the equations of motion, we will choose local fiber bundle coordinates (q^i, y^A, y^a) of $\mathcal{A}$ such that

$$M = \{(q^i, y^A, y^a) |\ y^a = \varphi^a(q^i, y^A)\},$$

and we obtain

$$E(q^i, y^A, y^a, p_A, p_a) = p_A y^A + p_a \varphi^a(q^i, y^A) - L(q^i, y^A).$$

Observe now that

$$\begin{aligned}
S_E &= \left\{ (q^i, p_A, p_a, \alpha_i, \beta^A, \beta^a) \in T^*\mathcal{A}^* \;\middle|\; \alpha_i = \frac{\partial E}{\partial q^i},\ \beta^A = \frac{\partial E}{\partial p_A},\ \beta^a = \frac{\partial E}{\partial p_a},\ \frac{\partial E}{\partial v^A} = 0 \right\} \\
&= \left\{ (q^i, p_A, p_a, \alpha_i, \beta^A, \beta^a) \in T^*\mathcal{A}^* \mid \alpha_i = -\frac{\partial L}{\partial q^i} + p_a \frac{\partial \varphi^a}{\partial q^i},\ \beta^A = y^A,\ \beta^a = \varphi^a(q^i, v^A)\ , \right. \\
&\qquad \left. p_A + p_a \frac{\partial \varphi^a}{\partial y^A} - \frac{\partial L}{\partial y^A} = 0 \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

and the solutions $\gamma(t) = (q^i(t), p_A(t), p_a(t))$ of the Dirac system $(D_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}^*}}, S_E)$ verify the following systems of equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{q}^i &= \rho^i_A y^A + \rho^i_a \varphi^a(q^i, y^A),\\
\dot{p}_a &= \rho^j_a \frac{\partial L}{\partial q^j} - \rho^j_a p_b \frac{\partial \varphi^b}{\partial q^j} - C^D_{aB} p_D y^B - C^c_{aB} p_c y^B\\
&\quad -C^D_{ab} p_D \varphi^b(q^i, y^A) - C^c_{ab} p_c \varphi^b(q^i, y^A),\\
\dot{p}_A &= \rho^j_A \frac{\partial L}{\partial q^j} - \rho^j_A p_b \frac{\partial \varphi^b}{\partial q^j} - C^D_{AB} p_D y^B - C^c_{AB} p_c y^B\\
&\quad -C^D_{Ab} p_D \varphi^b(q^i, y^B) - C^c_{Ab} p_c \varphi^b(q^i, y^B),\\
p_A &= \frac{\partial L}{\partial y^A} - p_b \frac{\partial \varphi^a}{\partial y^A}.
\end{aligned}$$

4.4 Optimal control theory

We will adopt the notation of Section 4.2. We consider the optimal control problem of an autonomous system with fixed initial and final boundary conditions q_0 and q_T, where $[0, T] \subset \mathbb{R}$ is a fixed interval. The set of admissible controls are piecewise-continuous functions of time taking values on a set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^m$. The state or control equations and associated boundary conditions have the form

$$\dot{q} = F(q, u)\,, \quad q(0) = q_0, \quad q(T) = q_T,$$

and the cost functional is:

$$\int_0^T L(q(t), u(t))\, dt.$$

The optimal control problem consists of finding the minimum value of the cost functional over the control set and to determine the solution of the state equations for this optimal control. The standard way to single out the solution candidates is via Pontryagin's maximum principle [Pontryagin, Boltyanskiĭ, Gamkrelidze, and Mishchenko, 1986], but we will show here how to characterize them using our framework.

Geometrically, an optimal control problem is determined by a control bundle $\tau_C : C \to Q$ (typically, $C = Q \times U$), a fibered mapping $F : C \to TQ$ such that $\tau_C = \tau_Q \circ F$ and a cost function $L\colon C \to \mathbb{R}$. Consider the bundle $C \,{}_{\tau_C}\!\times_{\pi_Q} T^*Q$ and the projection

$$\mathrm{pr}_2 : C \,{}_{\tau_C}\!\times_{\pi_Q} T^*Q \longrightarrow T^*Q.$$

The function $E : C \,{}_{\tau_C}\!\times_{\pi_Q} T^*Q \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$E(u_q, \alpha_q) = \langle \alpha_q, F(u_q) \rangle - L(u_q), \quad u_q \in C_q, \qquad \alpha_q \in T^*_q Q\,,$$

is not in general a Morse family over pr_2. Locally, $E(q^i, u^a, p_i) = p_i F^i(q^j, u^b) - L(q^j, u^b)$ (Pontryagin's Hamiltonian). The matrix

$$\left(p_j \frac{\partial^2 F^j}{\partial q^i \partial u^a} - \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial q^i \partial u^a}, \quad p_j \frac{\partial^2 F^j}{\partial u^a \partial u^b} - \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial u^a \partial u^b}, \quad \frac{\partial F^j}{\partial u^a} \right)$$

does not necessarily have maximum rank and, in consequence, it is not, in general, a Morse family. It may happen that S_E is not a immersed submanifold of T^*T^*Q. In any case, we can consider the system determined by (D_{ω_Q}, S_E) and the solutions are now given by:

$$(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t)) \oplus \mu_{\gamma(t)} \in (D_{\omega_Q})_{\gamma(t)} \quad t \in I,$$

where $\mu_{\gamma(t)} \in (S_E)_{\gamma(t)}$. Locally,

$$S_E = \left\{ (q^i, p_i, \alpha_i, \beta^i) \in T^*T^*Q \;\middle|\; \exists u \in U \text{ such that } \alpha_i = p_j \frac{\partial F^j}{\partial q^i} - \frac{\partial L}{\partial q^i}, \right.$$
$$\left. \beta^i = F^i(q,u),\ p_i \frac{\partial F^i}{\partial u^a} - \frac{\partial L}{\partial u^a} = 0 \right\}.$$

Following the same procedure as in the previous sections we obtain the equations of motion for the system (D_{ω_Q}, S_E)

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{q}^j &= F^j(q,u) = \frac{\partial E}{\partial p_j}\,, \\ \dot{p}_i &= \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial q^i} - p_j \frac{\partial F^j}{\partial q^i} \right) = -\frac{\partial E}{\partial q^i}, \\ 0 &= p_i \frac{\partial F^i}{\partial u^a} - \frac{\partial L}{\partial u^a} = \frac{\partial E}{\partial u^a}\,, \end{aligned}$$

which are the typical Pontryagin's equations for the Hamiltonian function $E : C \,{}_{\tau_C}\!\times_{\pi_Q} T^*Q \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

The case of general bundles. An interesting generalization of the previous optimal control problem consists of replacing TQ by a vector bundle $\mathcal{A}$ over Q. That is the following data are given: a control bundle $\tau_C : C \to Q$ and the fibered mapping $F : C \to \mathcal{A}$ (such that $\tau_C = \tau_A \circ F$) , a cost function $L\colon C \to \mathbb{R}$ and the Dirac structure $D_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}^*}}$ defined in Section 4.2. Consider the bundle $C \,{}_{\tau_C}\!\times_{\pi_{\mathcal{A}^*}} \mathcal{A}^*$ and the projection

$$\mathrm{pr}_2 : C \,{}_{\tau_C}\!\times_{\pi_{\mathcal{A}^*}} \mathcal{A}^* \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}^*.$$

The function $E : C \,{}_{\tau_C}\!\times_{\pi_{\mathcal{A}^*}} \mathcal{A}^* \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$E(u_q, \alpha_q) = \langle \alpha_q, F(u_q) \rangle - L(u_q)\,, \quad u_q \in C_q\,, \quad \alpha_q \in \mathcal{A}^*_q.$$

Locally

$$S_E = \left\{ (q^i, p_A, \alpha_i, \beta^A) \in T^*T^*Q \;\middle|\; \exists u \in U \text{ such that } \alpha_i = p_A \frac{\partial F^A}{\partial q^i} - \frac{\partial L}{\partial q^i}, \right.$$
$$\left. \beta^A = F^A(q,u),\ p_A \frac{\partial F^A}{\partial u^a} - \frac{\partial L}{\partial u^a} = 0 \right\}.$$

From the Dirac system $(D_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}^*}}, S_E)$ we obtain the equations of motion

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{q}^j &= \rho^j_A F^A(q,u)\,, \\ \dot{p}_A &= \rho^j_A \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial q^j} - p_B \frac{\partial F^B}{\partial q^j}\right) - \mathcal{C}^C_{AB} p_C F^B(q,u)\,, \\ 0 &= p_A \frac{\partial F^A}{\partial u^a} - \frac{\partial L}{\partial u^a}\,. \end{aligned}$$

These equations can be compared with the equations obtained for an optimal control problem defined on Lie algebroids in [Martínez, 2007]. When the function E is a Morse family, then everything falls into the description in [Barbero-Liñán, Iglesias Ponte, and Martín de Diego, 2015] where the integrability algorithm is used to find the solutions.

5 Dirac structures on vector bundles

In this section we introduce Dirac structures on vector bundles and, more generally, isotropic and coisotropic structures on vector bundles. These notions will be convenient in the forthcoming sections.

Linear isotropic and coisotropic structures. Let V be a finite dimensional vector space, and consider the direct sum $V \oplus V^*$ with the non-degenerate pairing $\ll \cdot, \cdot \gg$ defined in Section 2. Besides the notion of Dirac structure, we will need more general structures. A subspace $\Sigma \subset V \oplus V^*$ is called:

1) *isotropic* if $\Sigma \subset \Sigma^\perp$.

2) *coisotropic* if $\Sigma^\perp \subset \Sigma$.

Recall that "$\perp$" denotes the orthogonal w.r.t. the pairing $\ll \cdot, \cdot \gg$. It follows that if Σ is isotropic then $\Sigma^\perp$ is coisotropic and conversely. It can be shown that a Dirac structure $D \subset V \oplus V^*$ is characterized by one of the following three equivalent conditions: D is maximally isotropic, D is minimally coisotropic or D is both isotropic and coisotropic. One can also prove that a subspace Σ is isotropic if, and only if, it is a subspace of a Dirac structure. Similarly, Σ is coisotropic if, and only if, it contains a Dirac structure. We will need later the following lemma:

Lemma 5.1. *Let V, W be vector spaces and $\varphi\colon V \to W$ a linear map.*

i) If $\Sigma \subset V \oplus V^*$ is isotropic (resp. coisotropic), then $\mathcal{F}(\varphi)(\Sigma) \subset W \oplus W^*$ is isotropic (resp. coisotropic).

ii) If $\Sigma' \subset W \oplus W^*$ is isotropic (resp. coisotropic), then $\mathcal{B}(\varphi)(\Sigma') \subset V \oplus V^*$ is isotropic (resp. coisotropic).

Proof. Let Σ be isotropic. Consider a Dirac structure D such that $\Sigma \subset D$. Since the operator $\mathcal{F}(\varphi)$ preserves the inclusion, $\mathcal{F}(\varphi)(\Sigma) \subset \mathcal{F}(\varphi)(D)$. But $\mathcal{F}(\varphi)(D)$ is a Dirac structure, so $\mathcal{F}(\varphi)(\Sigma)$ is isotropic. If Σ is coisotropic, the reasoning is similar. The backward case is analogous using that $\mathcal{B}(\varphi)$ preserves the inclusion. ■

A description of isotropic and coisotropic structures in vector spaces can be found in Appendix B.

Dirac structures on vector bundles. A Dirac structure on a vector bundle $\pi_{(V,M)}\colon V \to M$ is a vector subbundle $D_V \subset V \oplus V^*$ such that, at each point $m \in M$, $(D_V)_m \subset V_m \oplus V_m^*$ is a linear Dirac structure on the vector space V_m. A vector bundle $\pi_{(V,M)}\colon V \to M$ endowed with a Dirac structure will be referred to as a *Dirac vector bundle*, and denoted by $(\pi_{(V,M)}, D_V)$. Note that this definition includes the case of the tangent bundle $TM \to M$ discussed in the previous sections.

The concepts of isotropic and coisotropic subspaces also extend to vector bundles without further difficulty. If $(\pi_{(V,M)}, D_V)$ and $(\pi_{(W,N)}, D_W)$ are Dirac vector bundles and $\Phi\colon V \to W$ is a vector bundle map, it is possible to define fiberwise the forward and backward Dirac structures $\mathcal{F}(\Phi)(D_V) \subset W \oplus W^*$ and $\mathcal{B}(\Phi)(D_W) \subset V \oplus V^*$. To ensure that these last two structures define Dirac structures one needs to verify that $\mathcal{F}(\Phi)(D_V)$ and $\mathcal{B}(\Phi)(D_W)$ are well defined vector subbundles. We will assume this condition is satisfied unless otherwise specified:

Assumption 1: Whenever we write expressions such as $\mathcal{F}(\Phi)(D_V)$ or $\mathcal{B}(\Phi)(D_W)$, it is assumed that they are well defined vector subbundles, unless otherwise stated.

We remark that for the case of Dirac structures on a manifold M (that is, in the language of this section, on the vector bundle $TM \to M$) some necessary conditions to obtain forward and backward Dirac structures have already been reviewed in Section 2. General conditions for the existence of the forward and backward maps of Dirac vector bundles can be found in [Cendra, Ratiu, and Yoshimura, 2017].

Remark 5.2. From now on, following the notation we have just introduced $D_{TM} \subset TM \oplus T^*M$ corresponds to the notion of Dirac structure on M as defined in Section 2.

6 Input-Output Port-Dirac Systems

In the previous sections we have argued that Dirac structures provide a unified framework to describe a wide class of systems. In this section we introduce *input-output port-Dirac systems*, a generalization of Dirac systems on vector bundles suitable for describing interconnections. They can be seen as particular examples of a more general class of Dirac systems, that we will call *Port-Dirac systems*, and which will be discussed later in Section 7. The notion of Port-Dirac system is essentially due to A. van der Schaft and collaborators, see [van der Schaft and Dimitri, 2014] and references therein.

6.1 Forward input-output port-Dirac systems

Here we will introduce the notion of *forward input-output (port-Dirac) system*, and the related notion of *open-forward (port-Dirac) system*. In the next subsection, we will describe the dual notions of *backward input-output (port-Dirac) system* and *open-backward input-output (port-Dirac) system*.

Forward input-output structures. A *forward input-output structure* is a 5-uple

$$A = \left(\pi_{(U_1,M)}, \pi_{(U_2,M)}, D_{U_1}, D_{U_2}, g_{U_2U_1}\right) \tag{6.1}$$

where $\pi_{(U_i,M)}\colon U_i \to M$, $i = 1, 2$, is a vector bundle, D_{U_i}, is a Dirac structure on U_i, $i = 1, 2$, and $g_{U_2U_1}\colon U_2 \to U_1$ is a vector bundle map over the identity $1_M : M \to M$. The following diagram is commutative:



We will simply write FIO-Structure instead of forward input-output structure. Given a FIO-Structure A as in (6.1), we associate to it the following Dirac structure on U_1:

$$D_A = \mathcal{F}(\Phi_A)\left(D_{U_1} \oplus D_{U_2}\right),$$

where $\Phi_A\colon U_1 \oplus U_2 \to U_1$ is the surjective vector bundle map over 1_M given by $\Phi_A(u_1 \oplus u_2) = u_1 + g_{U_2U_1}(u_2)$. Explicitly, D_A is the set of all $(u_1, \alpha_1) \in U_1 \oplus U_1^*$ such that there exists $(u_2, \alpha_2) \in U_2 \oplus U_2^*$ with

$$\left.\begin{aligned} (u_1 - g_{U_2U_1}(u_2), \alpha_1) &\in D_{U_1}, \\ (u_2, \alpha_2) &\in D_{U_2}, \\ g^*_{U_2U_1}\alpha_1 &= \alpha_2. \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{6.2}$$

Example 6.1. Consider the particular case in which D_{U_1} is the Dirac structure associated to a bivector Λ on U_1 and $D_{U_2} = U_2 \oplus \{0\}$. Then the system (6.2) reads

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 - g_{U_2U_1}(u_2) &= \sharp_\Lambda(\alpha_1), \\ g^*_{U_2U_1}(\alpha_1) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

or, equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 - \sharp_\Lambda(\alpha_1) &\in \operatorname{Im} g_{U_2U_1}, \\ \alpha_1 &\in (\operatorname{Im} g_{U_2U_1})^\circ. \end{aligned}$$

From this we can deduce that $F^{(*)}_{D_A} = (\operatorname{Im} g_{U_2U_1})^\circ$ and that D_A is the Dirac structure on U_1 determined by the codistribution $(\operatorname{Im} g_{U_2U_1})^\circ$ and the restriction of Λ to $(\operatorname{Im} g_{U_2U_1})^\circ$. Note that from the equations above it follows that $F_{D_A} = \sharp_\Lambda(\operatorname{Im} g_{U_2U_1})^\circ + \operatorname{Im} g_{U_2U_1}$.

A partial converse for this example can be easily proven under regularity conditions. Given any Dirac structure D on U_1 such that $F^{(*)}_D$ is a subbundle of U_1^*, there exists a bivector Λ on U_1, a vector bundle U_2 and a vector bundle map $g_{U_2U_1}\colon U_2 \to U_1$ such that for the FIO-Structure

$$A = (\pi_{(U_1,M)}, \pi_{(U_2,M)}, D_{U_1} = D_\Lambda, D_{U_2} = U_2 \oplus \{0\}, g_{U_2U_1})$$

we have $D_A = D$. In order to achieve this, first we must take U_2 and $g_{U_2U_1}$ in such a way that the condition $F_D^{(*)} = (\text{Im } g_{U_2U_1})^\circ$ be satisfied. By assumption, $F_D^{(*)}$ is a subbundle, so there exists a bivector $\tilde{\Lambda} : F_D^{(*)} \times F_D^{(*)} \to \mathbb{R}$ on F_D defining the Dirac structure D, which we can extend to a bivector $\Lambda \colon U_1^* \times U_1^* \to \mathbb{R}$. The fact that $D_A = D$ is easy to check.

Example 6.2. Consider two Dirac structures $D_1 \subset TM_1 \oplus T^*M_1$ and $D_2 \subset TM_2 \oplus T^*M_2$ over manifolds M_1 and M_2, respectively. We first construct the Dirac structure $D_1 \times D_2 \subset T(M_1 \times M_2) \oplus T^*(M_1 \times M_2)$.

Let $\tau : F \to M_1 \times M_2$ be a vector bundle and $g : F \to T(M_1 \times M_2)$ be a vector bundle morphism over the identity with $g(f) = (g_1(f), g_2(f)) \in T^*M_1 \times T^*M_2$. Fix a vector subbundle $\tilde{F}$ and consider the Dirac structure

$$D_{\tilde{F}} = \tilde{F} \oplus \tilde{F}^\circ \subset F \oplus F^*.$$

We define the FIO-Structure

$$A = \left(T(M_1 \times M_2), F, D_1 \times D_2, D_{\tilde{F}}, g = (g_1, g_2)\right),$$

and then D_A is given by the elements $(v_1, v_2, \alpha_1, \alpha_2) \in T(M_1 \times M_2) \oplus T^*(M_1 \times M_2)$ such that there exists an $f \in \tilde{F}$ and $e \in \tilde{F}^o$ verifying

$$\begin{aligned} (v_1 - g_1(f), \alpha_1) &\in D_1, \\ (v_1 - g_2(f), \alpha_2) &\in D_2, \\ g^*(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) &= e. \end{aligned}$$

We will denote this Dirac structure by $D_A = (D_1 \times D_2)^{(g, D_{\tilde{F}})}$.

If D_1 and D_2 are Dirac structures given by almost-Poisson bivectors Λ_1 and Λ_2 on M_1 and M_2, respectively, then $(D_1 \times D_2)^{(g, D_{\tilde{F}})}$ is given by the elements $(v_1, v_2, \alpha_1, \alpha_2) \in T(M_1 \times M_2) \oplus T^*(M_1 \times M_2)$ such that there exists an $f \in \tilde{F}$ and $e \in \tilde{F}^o$ verifying

$$\begin{aligned} v_1 - \sharp_{\Lambda_1}(\alpha_1) &= g_1(f), \\ v_2 - \sharp_{\Lambda_2}(\alpha_2) &= g_2(f), \\ g^*(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) &= e. \end{aligned}$$

A particular case occurs when $F = F_1 \times F_2 \to M_1 \times M_2$, where $\tau_1 : F_1 \to M_1$ and $\tau_2 : F_2 \to M_2$ are vector bundles, and the vector bundle morphism $g : F_1 \times F_2 \longrightarrow TM_1 \times TM_2$ is given by $g(f_1, f_2) = (g_1(f_1), g_2(f_2))$. For a fixed vector subbundle $\tilde{F} \subseteq F_1 \times F_2$, we derive the Dirac structure $(D_1 \times D_2)^{(g, D_{\tilde{F}})}$. It is given by the elements $(v_1, v_2, \alpha_1, \alpha_2) \in T(M_1 \times M_2) \oplus T^*(M_1 \times M_2)$ such that there exists $(f_1, f_2) \in \tilde{F} \subseteq F_1 \oplus F_2$ and $(e_1, e_2) \in \tilde{F}^\circ \subseteq F_1^\circ \oplus F_2^\circ$ verifying

$$\begin{aligned} v_1 - \sharp_{\Lambda_1}(\alpha_1) &= g_1(f_1), \\ v_2 - \sharp_{\Lambda_2}(\alpha_2) &= g_2(f_2), \\ g_1^*(\alpha_1) + g_2^*(\alpha_2) &= (e_1, e_2). \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, the following holds:

$$\langle \alpha_1, g_1(f_1)\rangle + \langle \alpha_2, g_2(f_2)\rangle = 0.$$

This is an example of interconnection of two Dirac structures that we will study in detail in Section 6.3.

Open-forward port-Dirac structures. We will call *open-forward input-output structure* (OFIO-Structure) objects obtained by replacing in the definition of a FIO-Structure A the Dirac structure D_{U_2} by the coisotropic structure $U_2 \oplus U_2^*$. Precisely, an OFIO-Structure is a 5-uple

$$A = \left(\pi_{(U_1,M)},\, \pi_{(U_2,M)},\, D_{U_1},\, U_2 \oplus U_2^*,\, g_{U_2U_1}\right),$$

where D_{U_1} is a Dirac structure on U_1 and $g_{U_2U_1}\colon U_2 \to U_1$ is a vector bundle map over the identity. Given a OFIO-Structure A, we associate to it the following coisotropic structure on U_1:

$$\Sigma_A = \mathcal{F}(\Phi_A)\left(D_{U_1} \oplus (U_2 \oplus U_2^*)\right)$$

where, as before, the map Φ_A is defined by $\Phi_A(u_1 \oplus u_2) = u_1 + g_{U_2U_1}(u_2)$. The fact that Σ_A defines a coisotropic structure follows directly from the fact that $D_{U_1} \oplus (U_2 \oplus U_2^*)$ is a coisotropic structure on $U_1 \oplus U_2$. We can deduce that Σ_A is the set of all $(u_1, \alpha_1) \in U_1 \oplus U_1^*$ such that there exists $(u_2, \alpha_2) \in U_2 \oplus U_2^*$ with

$$\left.\begin{aligned} (u_1 - g_{U_2U_1}(u_2), \alpha_1) \in D_{U_1}, \\ g^*_{U_2U_1}\alpha_1 = \alpha_2, \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{6.3}$$

or equivalently, since $(u_2, \alpha_2) \in U_2 \oplus U_2^*$ are arbitrary,

$$(u_1 - g_{U_2U_1}(u_2), \alpha_1) \in D_{U_1}.$$

Dynamics of FIO-Structures and OFIO-Structures. An important case of an FIO-Structure (or OFIO-Structure) A occurs when $U_1 = TM$. For a given energy function $E\colon M \to \mathbb{R}$, we will define the dynamics by the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} (x, \dot{x}) \oplus \mathrm{d}E(x) &\in D_A, && \text{if } A \text{ is a FIO-Structure.} \\ (x, \dot{x}) \oplus \mathrm{d}E(x) &\in \Sigma_A, && \text{if } A \text{ is an OFIO-Structure.} \end{aligned}$$

In the case of FIO-Structure (6.2), these equations become

$$\begin{aligned} ((x, \dot{x}) - g_{U_2U_1}(u_2), \mathrm{d}E(x)) &\in D_{U_1}, \\ (u_2, \alpha_2) &\in D_{U_2}, \\ g^*_{U_2U_1}(\mathrm{d}E(x)) &= \alpha_2. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for the case of an OFIO-Structure (6.3) one obtains the equations of motion:

$$\begin{aligned}((x,\dot{x}) - g_{U_2U_1}(u_2), \mathrm{d}E(x)) &\in D_{U_1},\\ g^*_{U_2U_1}\mathrm{d}E(x) &= \alpha_2.\end{aligned}$$

Note that in this case the second equation $g^*_{U_2U_1}\mathrm{d}E(x) = \alpha_2$ does not impose any restriction on the dynamics of the state variable x, but it has a physical meaning in the context of interconnection.

If A is a FIO-Structure and E is an energy function, the system $(x,\dot{x}) \oplus \mathrm{d}E(x) \in D_A$ is the Dirac system naturally associated to the FIO-Structure A and the energy function E. It will be called a *forward input-output system* (FIO-System). It is important to observe that the system $(x,\dot{x}) \oplus \mathrm{d}E(x) \in \Sigma_A$ (which occurs in case A is an OFIO-Structure) is not a Dirac system but a *coisotropic system* since Σ_A is a coisotropic structure.

Example 6.3. In the case $g_{U_2U_1} = 0$, the equations of an FIO-System become

$$((x,\dot{x}), \mathrm{d}E(x)) \in D_{U_1}.$$

Therefore the theory of Dirac systems is contained in the theory of Port-Dirac systems.

Example 6.4. Let A be the OFIO-Structure with D_{U_1} given by the graph of a Poisson bivector Λ on M. Then the dynamics is governed by the equation

$$(x,\dot{x}) = \sharp_\Lambda(\mathrm{d}E(x)) + g_{U_2U_1}(u_2)$$

which is simply a system with control parameters u_2. The interpretation is that of a system with "open ports" which might be used to model the various interactions of the system. The terminology "OFIO-System" is motivated by this observation.

The equations of motion of a OFIO-System should be compared with those of a "port-controlled generalized Hamiltonian system" (see [van der Schaft and Maschke, 1995], page 56):

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x} &= J(x)\frac{\partial E}{\partial x}(x) + g(x)f,\\ e &= g^T(x)\frac{\partial E}{\partial x}(x),\end{aligned}$$

where J plays the role of $\sharp_\Lambda$, f stands for the flows (inputs) of the system and $E = H$ is the Hamiltonian. The term e represents the efforts (outputs) of the system as it evolves according to the equation $\dot{x} = J(\partial E/\partial x) + gf$. This is one possible physical meaning for the "non-dynamical equation" $g^*_{U_2U_1}\mathrm{d}E(x) = \alpha_2$ discussed above.

Example 6.5. Let A be the FIO-Structure with D_{U_1} given by the graph of a Poisson bivector Λ on M and $D_{U_2} = U_2 \oplus \{0\}$. Then the dynamics is described by

$$\begin{aligned}(x,\dot{x}) &= \sharp_\Lambda(\mathrm{d}E(x)) + g_{U_2U_1}(u_2),\\ g^*_{U_2U_1}(\mathrm{d}E(x)) &= 0,\end{aligned}$$

which is a differential-algebraic equation (DAE).

As a particular case, we obtain, in the language of [Dalsmo and van der Schaft, 1999], the so-called "representation II" of the generalized Hamiltonian system with Hamiltonian $H = E$. In [Dalsmo and van der Schaft, 1999], the equations read (see page 64)

$$\dot{x} = J(x)\frac{\partial E}{\partial x}(x) + g(x)\lambda,$$
$$0 = g^T(x)\frac{\partial E}{\partial x}(x).$$

It also admits the interpretation of a port-controlled system with efforts (outputs) set equal to zero. The terms λ are interpreted as multipliers needed in order for the constraint equation $0 = g^T(x)\frac{\partial E}{\partial x}(x)$ to be satisfied. Note that the energy is conserved in view of the skew-symmetry of J and the constraint equation:

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = \frac{\partial E}{\partial x}\dot{x} = 0.$$

It is not hard to show that the conservation of energy holds true for any FIO-System.

Example 6.6. Consider a spring pendulum on the plane which is attached to a fixed peg O as depicted in Diagram 6.1. Assume that a force $F \in \mathbb{R}^2$ acts on the mass m. We will show how to describe this system as a OFIO-System.



Diagram 6.1: A force F acting on a spring pendulum.

We take polar coordinates $q = (r, \theta)$ as shown in Diagram 6.1, where the angle θ is measured with respect to a fixed frame at O. The configuration space is $T(\mathbb{R}\times S^1) = TQ$. The Lagrangian for the spring pendulum is the function on $T(\mathbb{R} \times S^1)$ given by:

$$L(q, v) = \frac{1}{2}m(v_r^2 + r^2 v_\theta^2) - \frac{1}{2}k(r - r_0)^2,$$

where k is the constant of the spring and r_0 denotes its natural length. We have the following energy function on $M = TQ \oplus T^*Q$:

$$E(q, v, p) = pv - L(q, v) = p_\theta v_\theta + p_r v_r - \frac{1}{2}m(v_r^2 + r^2 v_\theta^2) + \frac{1}{2}k(r - r_0)^2,$$

We denote by D_1 the usual Dirac structure on M obtained by pulling back ω_Q to M. We let $g_A : M \times \mathbb{R}^2 \to TM$ be the vector bundle map:

$$g_A(q, v, p, F) = (q, v, p, 0, 0, F),$$

where $F \in \mathbb{R}^2$. If we define the following OFIO-Structure

$$A = \left(TM, M \times \mathbb{R}^2, D_1, (M \times \mathbb{R}^2) \oplus (M \times \mathbb{R}^2)^*, g_A\right),$$

the equations of motion corresponding to A and the energy E are (recall that $x = (q, v, p)$):

$$\begin{aligned}(\dot{x} - g_A(F), \mathrm{d}E(x)) &\in D_1,\\ g_A^*(\mathrm{d}E(x)) &= \alpha,\end{aligned}$$

where $(F, \alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times (\mathbb{R}^2)^*$. If we write $F = (F_r, F_\theta)$, the dynamical equation $(\dot{x} - g_A(F), \mathrm{d}E(x)) \in D_1$ represents the dynamics of the spring pendulum acted by a force with components F_r and F_θ along the radial (r) and angular (θ) directions. For instance, it is immediate to check that the evolution equations for the momenta p_r and p_θ are:

$$\dot{p}_r - F_r = \frac{\partial L}{\partial r}, \qquad \dot{p}_\theta - F_\theta = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \theta}.$$

More generally, one can use the theory developed in Section 3 to describe systems which are determined using Morse families. We now show two examples of this situation:

Example 6.7. Assume that we are in the setting of Section 4.2. We have two mechanical systems defined by Dirac structures D_1 on $\mathcal{A}_1^*$ and D_2 on $\mathcal{A}_2^*$, where $\mathcal{A}_1^*$ and $\mathcal{A}_2^*$ are equipped with linear almost-Poisson bivectors $\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}_1^*}$ and $\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}_2^*}$, respectively. If we choose coordinates (q^i, p_A) and $(\bar{q}^{\bar{i}}, \bar{p}_{\bar{A}})$ on $\mathcal{A}_1^*$ and $\mathcal{A}_2^*$, we have the following the coordinate expressions:

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_{A_1^*} &= \rho_A^j \frac{\partial}{\partial q^j} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial p_A} - \frac{1}{2} C_{AB}^D p_D \frac{\partial}{\partial p_A} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial p_B},\\ \Lambda_{A_2^*} &= \bar{\rho}_{\bar{A}}^{\bar{j}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{q}^{\bar{j}}} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{p}_{\bar{A}}} - \frac{1}{2} \bar{C}_{\bar{A}\bar{B}}^{\bar{D}} \bar{p}_{\bar{D}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{p}_{\bar{A}}} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{p}_{\bar{B}}}.\end{aligned}$$

We also have Lagrangian functions $L_1 : \mathcal{A}_1 \to \mathbb{R}$ and $L_2 : \mathcal{A}_2 \to \mathbb{R}$ describing the dynamics on $\mathcal{A}_1^*$ and $\mathcal{A}_2^*$, respectively.

Consider vector bundles F_1 and F_2 over $\mathcal{A}_1^*$ and $\mathcal{A}_2^*$, resp., and vector bundle morphisms over the identity $g_1 : F_1 \to T\mathcal{A}_1^*$ and $g_2 : F_2 \to T\mathcal{A}_2^*$ such that $g_1(F_1) \subset V\tau_{\mathcal{A}_1^*}$ and $g_2(F_2) \subset V\tau_{\mathcal{A}_2^*}$. Fixing a subbundle $\tilde{F} \subseteq F_1 \times F_2$, we follow the construction in Example 6.2 and consider the Dirac structure $(D_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}_1^*}} \times D_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}_2^*}})^{(g, D_{\tilde{F}})}$ on $\mathcal{A}_1^* \times \mathcal{A}_2^*$. The equations of motion determined by the Lagrangian $L = L_1 + L_2 : \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2 \to \mathbb{R}$ and the Dirac structure $(D_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}_1^*}} \times D_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}_2^*}})^{(g, D_{\tilde{F}})}$ are then:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dq^i}{dt} &= \rho^i_A(q)v^A,\\
\frac{dp_A}{dt} &= \rho^j_A\frac{\partial L_1}{\partial q^j} - C^D_{AB}p_Dv^B + (g_1)_A(f_1),\\
\frac{d\bar{q}^{\bar{i}}}{dt} &= \bar{\rho}^{\bar{i}}_{\bar{A}}(\bar{q})\bar{v}^{\bar{A}},\\
\frac{d\bar{p}_{\bar{A}}}{dt} &= \bar{\rho}^{\bar{j}}_{\bar{A}}\frac{\partial L_2}{\partial \bar{q}^{\bar{j}}} - \bar{C}^{\bar{D}}_{\bar{A}\bar{B}}\bar{p}_{\bar{D}}\bar{v}^{\bar{B}} + (g_2)_{\bar{A}}(f_2),\\
p_A &= \frac{\partial L_1}{\partial v^A}\,, \qquad \bar{p}_{\bar{A}} = \frac{\partial L_2}{\partial \bar{v}^{\bar{A}}},\\
0 &= (g_1)_A(\tilde{f}_1)v^A + (g_2)_{\bar{A}}(\tilde{f}_2)\bar{v}^{\bar{A}},
\end{aligned}$$

for all $(\tilde{f}_1, \tilde{f}_2) \in \tilde{F}$, which is a DAE.

Example 6.8. Let $\tau : \mathcal{A} \to Q$ be a Lie algebroid and $\mathcal{D}$ a vector subbundle of $\mathcal{A}$. We construct the vector bundle over Q given by $F = \mathcal{A}^* \oplus \mathcal{D}^\circ$ and define the vector bundle morphism $g : F \to T\mathcal{A}^*$ over the identity in $\mathcal{A}^*$ given by:

$$g(b, f) = \frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t=0}(b + tf) \in T_b\mathcal{A}^*,$$

where $b \in \mathcal{A}^*$, $f \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$. Observe that by construction $g(b, f)$ lives in the vertical space $V_b\tau_{A^*}$ of τ_{A^*}.

Given a basis of sections $\{\mu_a\}$ of $D^o \to Q$, we have the following coordinate representation of the mapping g:

$$g(q^i, p_\alpha, \lambda^a) = (q^i, p_\alpha, 0, \lambda_a\mu^a_\alpha(q)) \equiv \lambda_a\mu^a_\alpha(q)\frac{\partial}{\partial p_\alpha}.$$

We consider the FIO-Structure

$$A = (T\mathcal{A}^*, F, D_{\Lambda_{A^*}}, F \oplus F^\circ, g_A),$$

and the energy $E : \mathcal{A} \oplus \mathcal{A}^* \to \mathbb{R}$ determined by a Lagrangian $L : A \to \mathbb{R}$. Then the Dirac system $(x, \dot{x}) \oplus \mu \in D_A$, with $\mu \in S_E$, gives the following system of equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dq^i}{dt} &= \rho^i_A(q)v^A,\\
\frac{dp_A}{dt} &= \rho^j_A\frac{\partial L}{\partial q^j} - C^D_{AB}p_Dv^B + \lambda_a\mu^a_A(q),\\
p_A &= \frac{\partial L}{\partial v^A},\\
0 &= \mu^a_A(q)v^A.
\end{aligned}$$

These are precisely the equations of a nonholonomic system defined by a Lagrangian $L : A \to \mathbb{R}$ and a vector subbundle $\mathcal{D}$. See [Cortés, de León, Marrero, and Martínez, 2009] for more details.

6.2 Backward port-Dirac systems

We now turn to the notions of *backward port-Dirac structures* and *open-backward port-Dirac structures*. The definitions and results are very similar to those of the forward case. Statements related to "backward" are dual from those related to "forward" and could be obtained one from each other directly, but we will describe them separately in detail because the concrete expressions that appear in each case are useful in particular examples and help to relate the results to those in the literature.

Backward port-Dirac structures. A *backward port-Dirac structures* (BIO-Structure for short) is a 5-uple

$$A = \left(\pi_{(U_1,M)}, \pi_{(U_2,M)}, D_{U_1}, D_{U_2}, p_{U_1U_2}\right)$$

where $\pi_{(U_i,M)} \colon U_i \to M,\ i = 1, 2$, is a vector bundle, D_{U_i} is a Dirac structure on $U_i,\ i = 1, 2$, and $p_{U_1U_2} \colon U_1 \to U_2$ is a vector bundle map over the identity 1_M. The following diagram is commutative



Given a BIO-Structure A as above, we associate to it the following Dirac structure on U_1:

$$D_A = \mathcal{B}(\Psi_A)\left(D_{U_1} \oplus D_{U_2}\right),$$

where $\Psi_A \colon U_1 \to U_1 \oplus U_2$ is the injective vector bundle map over 1_M given by $\Psi_A(u_1) = u_1 \oplus p_{U_1U_2}(u_1)$. Note that D_A is the set of all $(u_1, \alpha_1) \in U_1 \oplus U_1^*$ such that there exists $(u_2, \alpha_2) \in U_2 \oplus U_2^*$ with

$$\left.\begin{aligned} (u_1, \alpha_1 - p^*_{U_1U_2}\alpha_2) &\in D_{U_1}, \\ (u_2, \alpha_2) &\in D_{U_2}, \\ p_{U_1U_2}(u_1) &= u_2. \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{6.4}$$

Example 6.9. This example is the dual of Example 6.1. Let D_{U_1} be the Dirac structure associated to a 2-form ω on U_1 and $D_{U_2} = \{0\} \oplus U_2^*$. The equations (6.4) are

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(u_1) &= \alpha_1 - p^*_{U_1U_2}\alpha_2, \\ p_{U_1U_2}(u_1) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

or, using that $(\operatorname{Im} p^*_{U_1U_2})^\circ = \ker p_{U_1U_2}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(u_1) - \alpha_1 &\in (\ker p_{U_1U_2})^\circ, \\ u_1 &\in \ker p_{U_1U_2}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $F_{D_A} = \ker p_{U_1U_2}$. Then D_A is the Dirac structure on U_1 determined by the distribution $\ker p_{U_1U_2}$ and the restriction of ω to a 2-form on it. We also see that that $F^{(*)}_{D_A} = \omega^\flat(\ker p_{U_1U_2}) + (\ker p_{U_1U_2})^\circ$. It is possible to prove a partial converse in the same way as in Example 6.1.

Example 6.10 (Tensor product). Consider the case where $U_1 = U_2 = TM$, and we denote the Dirac structures by D_1 and D_2, respectively. Take the map $p_{U_1U_2} : TM \to TM$ to be the identity. Then (6.4) becomes

$$\left.\begin{aligned}(u_1, \alpha_1 - \alpha_2) \in D_1,\\ (u_1, \alpha_2) \in D_2,\end{aligned}\right\}$$

This coincides with the so-called tensor product $D_1 \boxtimes D_2$ of the Dirac structures D_1 and D_2 (see [Gualtieri, 2011]), which is often described as follows. Consider the diagonal embedding $d : M \to M \times M$, then:

$$D_1 \boxtimes D_2 = \mathcal{B}(d)(D_1 \times D_2) \subset TM \oplus T^*M.$$

This construction is also known as bowtie product of D_1 and D_2 (denoted $D_1 \bowtie D_2$). For applications of the tensor product in the interconnection of Dirac structures, we refer to [Jacobs and Yoshimura, 2014] and references therein.

Open-backward port-Dirac structures. An *open-backward port-Dirac systems* (OBIO-Structure) is a 5-uple

$$A = \left(\pi_{(U_1,M)},\, \pi_{(U_2,M)},\, D_{U_1},\, U_2 \oplus U_2^*,\, p_{U_1U_2}\right).$$

Associated to a OBIO-Structure A we consider the coisotropic structure on U_2 given by:

$$\Sigma_A = \mathcal{B}(\Psi_A)\left(D_{U_1} \oplus (U_2 \oplus U_2^*)\right)$$

where the map $\Psi_A \colon U_1 \to U_1 \oplus U_2$ is defined as before: $\Psi_A \colon U_1 \to U_1 \oplus U_2$ is given by $\Psi_A(u_1) = u_1 \oplus p_{U_1U_2}(u_1)$. One checks that Σ_A is the set of all $(u_1, \alpha_1) \in U_1 \oplus U_1^*$ such that there exists $(u_2, \alpha_2) \in U_2 \oplus U_2^*$ with

$$\left.\begin{aligned}(u_1, \alpha_1 - p^*_{U_1U_2}(\alpha_2)) \in D_{U_1},\\ p_{U_1U_2}(u_1) = u_2,\end{aligned}\right\} \tag{6.5}$$

or, taking into account that $(u_2, \alpha_2) \in U_2 \oplus U_2^*$ are arbitrary,

$$(u_1, \alpha_1 - p^*_{U_1U_2}(\alpha_2)) \in D_{U_1}.$$

Dynamics of BIO-Structures and OBIO-Structures. Let A be an BIO-Structure or OBIO-Structure with $U_1 = TM$. If $E \colon M \to \mathbb{R}$ is an energy function, the dynamics is:

$$\begin{aligned}(x, \dot{x}) \oplus \mathrm{d}E(x) &\in D_A, && \text{if } A \text{ is a BIO-Structure.}\\ (x, \dot{x}) \oplus \mathrm{d}E(x) &\in \Sigma_A, && \text{if } A \text{ is an OBIO-Structure.}\end{aligned}$$

The equations of motion in the case of a BIO-Structure (6.4) are

$$\begin{aligned}((x,\dot{x}),\mathrm{d}E(x)-p^*_{U_1U_2}\alpha_2)&\in D_{U_1},\\(u_2,\alpha_2)&\in D_{U_2},\\p_{U_1U_2}(x,\dot{x})&=u_2.\end{aligned}$$

The case of a OBIO-Structure (6.5) one obtains the equations of motion:

$$\begin{aligned}((x,\dot{x}),\mathrm{d}E(x)-p^*_{U_1U_2}\alpha_2)&\in D_{U_1},\\p_{U_1U_2}(x,\dot{x})&=u_2.\end{aligned}$$

We observe that in this case the equation $p_{U_1U_2}(x,\dot{x}) = u_2$ does not impose any restriction on the dynamics.

The system $(x,\dot{x}) \oplus \mathrm{d}E(x) \in D_A$ is the Dirac system associated to the BIO-Structure A and the energy function E. It will be called a *backward input-output system* (BIO-System). The system $(x,\dot{x}) \oplus \mathrm{d}E(x) \in \Sigma_A$ (when A is an OFIO-Structure) is a coisotropic system.

Example 6.11. Let A be the BIO-Structure with $U_1 = TM$ and D_{U_1} given by the graph of a presymplectic form ω on M, and $D_{U_2} = \{0\} \oplus U_2^*$. The equations are:

$$\begin{aligned}\omega^\flat(\dot{x}) &= \mathrm{d}E(x) - p^*_{U_1U_2}\alpha_2,\\p_{U_1U_2}(x,\dot{x}) &= 0,\end{aligned}$$

which is a DAE. This is the so-called "representation III" on [Dalsmo and van der Schaft, 1999].

6.3 Interconnection of input-output systems

The aim of this section is to describe how the structures and methods introduced earlier can be used to define and construct interconnected systems. We will do this via some illustrative examples that have been considered in the literature with different methods. As we have already pointed out in the introduction, a full development of this approach will be the purpose of a future work

Interconnection of OFIO-Systems. As shown before (see the examples in Section 6.1), an OFIO-System serves as a model for a dynamical system with open ports, i.e. a system for which interaction with other systems (or "environment") is possible. We will now describe how, given an interconnecting Dirac structure, it is possible to connect a family of OFIO-Systems through the ports in such a way that the resulting system is a FIO-System representing the dynamics of the interconnected system. First, we show how to interconnect OFIO-Structures.

Let

$$A_i = (\pi_{(U_{1,i},M_i)},\, \pi_{(U_{2,i},M_i)},\, D_{U_{1,i}},\, U_{2,i} \oplus U^*_{2,i},\, g_{U_{2,i}U_{1,i}}), \quad i = 1,\dots,N,$$

be a family of OFIO-Structures. If we consider the product manifold $M = M_1 \times M_2 \times \cdots \times M_N$, we can define vector bundles $U_1 \to M$ and $U_2 \to M$ by

$$U_1 = U_{1,1} \times U_{1,2} \times ... \times U_{1,N}, \qquad U_2 = U_{2,1} \times U_{2,2} \times ... \times U_{2,N}.$$

Using that $D_{U_{1,i}} \subset U_{1,i} \oplus U_{1,i}^*$ is a Dirac structure for each $i = 1, \ldots, N$, it is easy to verify that

$$D_{U_1} = D_{U_{1,1}} \times D_{U_{1,2}} \times \cdots \times D_{U_{1,N}} \subset U_1 \oplus U_1^*$$

defines a Dirac structure on U_1. Finally we can also construct a vector bundle map $g_{U_2U_1} : U_2 \to U_1$ as follows:

$$g_{U_2U_1} = g_{U_{2,1}U_{1,1}} \times g_{U_{2,2}U_{1,2}} \times \cdots \times g_{U_{2,N}U_{1,N}}.$$

With these notations, we define the *product port-Dirac structure of the family* $\{A_i\}_i$, denoted $A_1 \times A_2 \times \cdots \times A_N$, to be the OFIO-Structure given by:

$$A_1 \times A_2 \times \cdots \times A_N = (\pi_{(U_1,M)}, \pi_{(U_2,M)}, D_{U_1}, U_2 \oplus U_2^*, g_{U_2U_1}).$$

Definition 6.12. Given a Dirac structure D_{U_2} on U_2, the *interconnection of the* OFIO-*Structures* $A_1, \ldots A_N$ *by* D_{U_2} is the FIO-Structure

$$(\pi_{(U_1,M)}, \pi_{(U_2,M)}, D_{U_1}, D_{U_2}, g_{U_2U_1}). \tag{6.6}$$

The case of greatest interest occurs when each A_i represent some dynamical systems to be interconnected. In this case, we have $U_{1,i} = TM_i$, and there are energy functions $E_i : M_i \to \mathbb{R}$. Then we identify $U_1 = TM$, and we can consider the dynamics given by the total energy $E = E_1 + \cdots + E_N$ on M (here it is understood that each energy E_i is pulled back to M via the projection $M \to M_i$).

Example 6.13. Take $N = 1$, that is we want to interconnect a single OFIO-System. Consider the system in Example 6.4:

$$\dot{x} = J(x)\frac{\partial E}{\partial x}(x) + g(x)f,$$
$$e = g^T(x)\frac{\partial E}{\partial x}(x).$$

In our language, the flows f and efforts e are such that $(f, e) \in U_2 \oplus U_2^*$. To interconnect the system, we choose a Dirac structure $D \subset U_2 \oplus U_2^*$. One choice is to set the efforts to zero, namely to consider $D = U_2 \oplus \{0\}$, and then the resulting dynamics is precisely that of Example 6.5. The interpretation is that we have "interconnected" or "closed" the ports.

It is a very important observation that Dirac structures $D \subset U_2 \oplus U_2^*$ represent *power-conserving* interconnections (see [Dalsmo and van der Schaft, 1999]).

Example 6.14. Consider now a family of N systems as in Example 6.4, each of them with flows and efforts $(f_i, e_i) \in U_{2,i} \oplus U_{2,i}^*$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$. To interconnect them one uses a chosen Dirac structure on $U_2 = U_{2,1} \times \cdots \times U_{2,N}$ as in (6.6). This is the geometric version of Proposition 2.2 in [Dalsmo and van der Schaft, 1999] (page 59). The interpretation is that one connects the family of system through the ports.

Interconnection of an OBIO-Systems. We now describe how to interconnect a family of OBIO-Structures through the ports in such a way that the resulting structure is a BIO-Structure. The construction is completely analogous to the forward case. Let

$$A_i = (\pi_{(U_{1,i},M_i)},\, \pi_{(U_{2,i},M_i)},\, D_{U_{1,i}},\, U_{2,i} \oplus U_{2,i}^*,\, p_{U_{1,i}U_{2,i}}), \quad i = 1, \dots, N,$$

be a family of OBIO-Structures. With the same notations as in the forward case, we consider the manifold M, the vector bundles $U_1 \to M$ and $U_2 \to M$, and the Dirac structure D_{U_1}. The map $p_{U_1U_2} \colon U_1 \to U_2$ is defined by

$$p_{U_1U_2} = p_{U_{1,1}U_{2,1}} \times p_{U_{1,2}U_{2,2}} \times \cdots \times p_{U_{1,N}U_{2,N}}.$$

With these notations, we define the *product port-Dirac structure of the family* $\{A_i\}_i$, denoted $A_1 \times A_2 \times \cdots \times A_N$, to be the OBIO-Structure given by:

$$A_1 \times A_2 \times \cdots \times A_N = (\pi_{(U_1,M)}, \pi_{(U_2,M)}, D_{U_1}, U_2 \oplus U_2^*, p_{U_1U_2}).$$

Definition 6.15. Given a Dirac structure D_{U_2} on U_2, the *interconnection of the* OBIO-*Structure* $A_1, \dots A_N$ *by* D_{U_2} is the BIO-Structure

$$(\pi_{(U_1,M)},\, \pi_{(U_2,M)},\, D_{U_1},\, D_{U_2},\, p_{U_1U_2}).$$

When each A_i has dynamics given by the energy function E_i, then on $U_1 = TM$ we consider the dynamics given by the total energy $E = E_1 + \cdots + E_N$ on M.

Example 6.16. Consider the following LC circuit, with two inductors (L_1 and L_3) and two capacitors (C_2 and C_4):



Diagram 6.2: The circuit of Example 6.16.

To obtain the Dirac system associated to the circuit we will follow the formalism on [Cendra, Etchechoury, and Ferraro, 2014] which provides equations in the bundle $M = TQ \oplus T^*Q$.

We label the branches according to the numbering of inductors and capacitors: for instance the branch "3" is the branch with the inductor L_3. The configuration space is a vector space Q (the charge space), and an element $q = (q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4) \in Q$

represents charges in the branches 1, 2, 3 and 4 respectively. The Lagrangian on $TQ \simeq Q \times Q$ is given by:

$$L(q,v) = \frac{1}{2}L_1 v_1^2 + \frac{1}{2}L_3 v_3^2 - \frac{1}{2}\frac{q_2^2}{C_2} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{q_4^2}{C_4}.$$

The v_i $(i = 1,2,3,4)$ represents the currents in each branch. The sign convention for the currents in each branch is described in Diagram 6.2. The energy on $M = TQ \oplus T^*Q \simeq Q \times Q \times Q$ reads:

$$E(q,v,p) = pv - L(q,v).$$

The KCL (Kirchhoff's Current Law) gives raise to the distribution $\Delta \subset TQ \simeq Q \times Q$ which is independent of q. We have $\Delta = Q \times \Delta_q$ with

$$\Delta_q = \{v \in T_qQ \mid v_1 - v_4 = 0, v_3 - v_2 = 0, v_4 - v_3 = 0\}.$$

Its annihilator $\Delta_q^\circ \subset T_q^*Q$, representing KCL (Kirchhoff's Voltage Law), is then

$$\Delta_q^\circ = \{p \in T_q^*Q \mid p_1 = p_2 = p_3 = p_4\}.$$

Consider the distribution in M given by $\Delta_M = T\bar{\tau}^{-1}(\Delta)$, where $\bar{\tau} : M \to Q$ is the projection. It is easy to see that $\Delta_M = \{(q,v,p,\dot{q},\dot{v},\dot{p}) \mid \dot{q} \in \Delta\}$, i.e. we have the invariant distribution (independent of $x \in M$)

$$\Delta_M = \{(q,v,p,\dot{q},\dot{v},\dot{p}) \mid \dot{q}_1 - \dot{q}_4 = 0, \dot{q}_3 - \dot{q}_2 = 0, \dot{q}_4 - \dot{q}_3 = 0\}.$$

Let $D_1 \subset TM \oplus T^*M$ be the Dirac structure determined by the pullback of ω_Q to M acting on the constraint distribution Δ_M (see Theorem 2.3). Then one can check (compare also with (A.2))

$$D_1 = \{(q,v,p,\dot{q},\dot{v},\dot{p},\alpha,\gamma,\beta) \mid \dot{q} \in \Delta, \dot{p} + \alpha \in \Delta^\circ,\ \gamma = 0,\ \dot{q} - \beta = 0\}.$$

The equations of the circuit are then given by the Dirac system on M with Dirac structure D_1 and energy function E,

$$(x,\dot{x}) \oplus \mathrm{d}E \in D_1,$$

where $x = (q,v,p)$. It follows that the equations of motion are:

$$\dot{q} \in \Delta, \qquad \dot{q} = v, \qquad p = \frac{\partial L}{\partial v}, \qquad \dot{p} - \frac{\partial L}{\partial q} \in \Delta^\circ.$$

Assume now that we want to attach 2 ports to the circuit (for instance, to study interconnection) as indicated in Diagram 6.3 (left). To model this open system, we define the map $p_A : TM \to M \times \mathbb{R}^2$ given by:

$$p_A(q,v,p,\dot{q},\dot{v},\dot{p}) = (q,v,p,\dot{q}_3 - \dot{q}_2, \dot{q}_1 - \dot{q}_4).$$

We then have the following OBIO-Structure

$$A = \left(TM, M \times \mathbb{R}^2, D_1, (M \times \mathbb{R}^2) \oplus (M \times \mathbb{R}^2)^*, p_A\right).$$

Note that the dual map $(p_A)^* : (M \times \mathbb{R}^2)^* \simeq M \times \mathbb{R}^2 \to T^*M$ is given by

$$(p_A)^*(q, v, p, e_1, e_2) = (q, v, p, e_1(\alpha_3 - \alpha_2) + e_2(\alpha_1 - \alpha_4), 0, 0),$$

(recall that α_i is the dual of $\dot{q}^i$).



Diagram 6.3: The circuit before (left) and after (right) closing the ports.

If we denote an element in $(M \times \mathbb{R}^2) \oplus (M \times \mathbb{R}^2)^*$ by (x, f_1, f_2, e_1, e_2) (with $x = (q, v, p) \in M$), the dynamics of A have the form (see Section 6.2)

$$\begin{aligned}((x, \dot{x}), \mathrm{d}E(x) - p_A^*(e_1, e_2)) &\in D_1,\\ p_A(x, \dot{x}) &= (f_1, f_2),\end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}\big((x, \dot{x}), \mathrm{d}E(x) - e_1(\alpha_3 - \alpha_2) - e_2(\alpha_1 - \alpha_4)\big) &\in D_1,\\ (\dot{q}_3 - \dot{q}_2, \dot{q}_1 - \dot{q}_4) &= (f_1, f_2).\end{aligned}$$

Let us finally show that closing the ports (f_1, e_1) and (f_2, e_2) corresponds to introducing a Dirac structure D_2 on the vector bundle $M \times \mathbb{R}^2 \to M$ modeling the space of ports. Consider the invariant Dirac structure

$$D_2 = \{(q, v, p, f_1, e_1, f_2, e_2) \mid f_1 + f_2 = 0, e_1 = e_2\} \subset (M \times \mathbb{R}^2) \oplus (M \times \mathbb{R}^2)^*.$$

Closing the ports in the OBIO-Structure A gives the BIO-Structure

$$A = \left(TM, M \times \mathbb{R}^2, D_1, D_2, p_A\right),$$

which has equations of motion

$$\begin{aligned}((x, \dot{x}), \mathrm{d}E(x) - p_A^*(e_1, e_2)) &\in D_1,\\ ((f_1, f_2), (e_1, e_2)) &\in D_2,\\ p_A(x, \dot{x}) &= (f_1, f_2).\end{aligned}$$

The second equations tells us that the voltages e_1 and e_2 are the same at the nodes N_1 and N_2, and that the currents f_1 and f_2 are equal. This is depicted in Diagram 6.3 (right).

Example 6.17. A similar example is given by a disconnected LC circuit with ports $(f, e) = (f_i, e_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, 4$, with two components as shown in Diagram 6.4.



Diagram 6.4: The circuit of Example 6.17.

The space of charges is a 7-dimensional vector space. One can proceed like in the previous example, and model it using an OBIO-Structure of the form

$$A = (TM, M \times \mathbb{R}^4, D_1, (M \times \mathbb{R}^4) \oplus (M \times \mathbb{R}^4)^*, p_A).$$

Closing the ports with the Dirac structure $D_2 \subset (M \times \mathbb{R}^4) \oplus (M \times \mathbb{R}^4)^*)$ given by

$$D_2 = \{(q, v, p, f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4, e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4) \mid f_1 = -f_3, f_2 = -f_4, e_1 = e_3, e_2 = e_4\}$$

leads to the following circuit:



Example 6.18. Consider the system in Diagram 6.5 (left). It consists of two subsystems: a pendulum of mass M (with a massless rod of length $\ell = 1$) and a free particle of mass m, both subject to the gravitational field. The coordinate θ determines the position of the mass M and the coordinates x and y determine the position of the mass m. The configuration space is $Q = S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^2$, and the Hamiltonian of the system is:

$$H = \frac{p_\theta^2}{2M} + \frac{(p_x^2 + p_y^2)}{2m} - Mg\cos\theta - mgy,$$

which is a function on $T^*Q = T^*(S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^2)$. We denote by $D_1 = \text{graph}(\omega_Q)$ the standard Dirac structure on the tangent bundle $TT^*Q \to T^*Q$.



Diagram 6.5: Adding ports to a pendulum and a free mass.

We will see how to interconnect these systems so that in the resulting system both masses stick together. First, we add ports representing the velocities as shown in Diagram 6.5 (right), so that the resulting system is an OBIO-Structure. This is accomplished using the map $p_A : TT^*Q \to T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}^4$, fibered over the identity on T^*Q, given by

$$p_A(\dot\theta, \dot x, \dot y, \dot p_\theta, \dot p_x, \dot p_y) = (\dot\theta \cos\theta, -\dot\theta \sin\theta, \dot x, \dot y),$$

where we have omitted the base point in T^*Q for simplicity.

The system with ports is described by the following OBIO-Structure:

$$A = (TT^*Q, T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}^4, D_1, (T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}^4) \oplus (T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}^4)^*, p_A).$$

The dual of the map p_A, $(p_A)^* : T^*Q \times (\mathbb{R}^4)^* \to T^*T^*Q$ is given by

$$(p_A)^*(e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4) = (e_1 \cos\theta - e_2 \sin\theta, e_3, e_4, 0, 0, 0),$$

where again we have omitted the base point.

We close the ports with the Dirac structure $D_2 \subset (T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}^4) \oplus (T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}^4)^*$ given by:

$$D_2 = \{(f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4) \oplus (e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4) \mid f_1 = f_3, f_2 = f_4, e_1 = -e_3, e_2 = -e_4\}.$$

Taking the energy function $E = H$, the dynamics of A reads

$$\begin{aligned} ((\alpha, \dot\alpha), \mathrm{d}E(\alpha) - (e_1 \cos\theta - e_2 \sin\theta, e_3, e_4, 0, 0, 0)) &\in D_1, \\ ((f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4), (e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4)) &\in D_2, \\ (\dot\theta \cos\theta, -\dot\theta \sin\theta, \dot x, \dot y) &= (f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4), \end{aligned}$$

with $\alpha = (\theta, x, y, p_\theta, p_x, p_y) \in T^*Q$. The second relation implies

$$\dot\theta \cos\theta = \dot x, \quad -\dot\theta \sin\theta = \dot y, \quad e_1 = -e_3, \quad e_2 = -e_4.$$

In particular, we have $x(t) = \sin(\theta(t))$ and $y(t) = \cos(\theta(t))$. Therefore, when an initial condition $(\theta(0), x(0), y(0))$ is chosen in such a way that $x(0) = \sin(\theta(0))$ and

$y(0) = \cos(\theta(0))$ is satisfied, the masses m and M remain attached one to another. We remark that the first relation reads:

$$\dot{p}_\theta = -Mg\sin\theta + e_1\cos\theta - e_2\sin\theta, \qquad \dot{p}_x = -e_1, \qquad \dot{p}_y = mg - e_2,$$
$$\dot{\theta} = p_\theta/M, \qquad \dot{x} = p_x/m, \qquad \dot{y} = p_y/m,$$

which in particular implies the following relation for the momenta:

$$\dot{p}_\theta = -(M+m)g\sin\theta - \dot{p}_x\cos\theta + \dot{p}_y\sin\theta.$$

7 Port-Dirac systems

We will now briefly discuss an important class of Dirac systems, that we will call Port-Dirac systems, which includes Input-Output systems as particular cases. As mentioned in the Introduction, this notion is essentially due to van der Schaft and collaborators (see e.g. [van der Schaft and Dimitri, 2014] and references therein). Finally, we study the so-called composition of PD-systems, and show that it extends the interconnection of Input-Output systems.

7.1 General definitions

We first give the basic definitions to study the geometry of systems with ports:

Definition 7.1. A *Port-Dirac Structure* is a triple

$$A = (\pi_{(U_1,M)}, \pi_{(U_2,M)}, D_{(U_1\oplus U_2)})$$

where $\pi_{(U_i,M)}\colon U_i \to M,\ i = 1, 2$, are vector bundles over M and $D_{U_1\oplus U_2}$ is a Dirac structure on the vector bundle $U_1 \oplus U_2$.

Definition 7.2. A *Port-Dirac System* is a pair $(A, \mathrm{d}E)$ where A is a PD-Structure of the form

$$A = (\tau_M, \pi_{(U_2,M)}, D_{(U_1\oplus U_2)})$$

with $\tau_M : TM \to M$ the tangent bundle of M, and $E : M \to \mathbb{R}$ is an energy function.

For short, we will often write PD-Structure and PD-System instead of Port-Dirac Structure and Port-Dirac System, respectively. Given a PD-System $(A, \mathrm{d}E)$, it determines a dynamics given by the following Dirac system:

$$\Big((x,\dot{x}) \oplus (x,u_2), (x,\mathrm{d}E(x)) \oplus (x,-\alpha_2)\Big) \in D_{(U_1\oplus U_2)}, \tag{7.1}$$

which we will simply write as $(\dot{x}, u_2, \mathrm{d}E(x), -\alpha_2) \in D_{(U_1\oplus U_2)}$. The coordinates x are known as *state* (sometimes also *energy* or *energy-storing*) variables, while u_2

and α_2 the (external) *flows* and *efforts*, respectively. The power balance equation (which holds in view of the isotropy of $D_{(U_1 \oplus U_2)}$)

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}E}{dt} = \langle \alpha_2, u_2 \rangle$$

expresses that the gain of energy corresponds to the power transmitted by the ports. The sign of α_2 in (7.1) is the same as in [van der Schaft and Maschke, 1995].

7.2 Composition of PD-Systems.

One important operation between PD-Systems consists on interconnecting them via a power-conserving Dirac structure between some of the ports. This interconnection procedure has been studied in the context of Port-Hamiltonian systems under the terminology of *composition of Dirac structures* (see [Cervera, van der Schaft, and Baños, 2007] and references therein). Next, we will describe this notion in the context of PD-Structures in terms of the forward and backward constructions.

The linear case. Consider finite dimensional vector spaces U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2. In what follows, we will write $u_i \in U_i$, $v_i \in V_i$, $\alpha_i \in U_i^*$ and $\beta_i \in V_i^*$ to denote elements in U_i, V_i, and in their duals. We define maps

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi : U_1 \times U_2 \times V_1 \times V_2 &\to U_1 \times U_2 \times U_2 \times V_1 \times V_2 \times V_2, \\ (u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2) &\mapsto (u_1, u_2, u_2, v_1, v_2, v_2), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \psi : U_1 \times U_2 \times V_1 \times V_2 &\to U_1 \times V_1, \\ (u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2) &\mapsto (u_1, v_1). \end{aligned}$$

Assume that we have Dirac structures $D_{(U_1 \oplus U_2)}$ on $U_1 \oplus U_2$, $D_{(V_1 \oplus V_2)}$ on $V_1 \oplus V_2$, and D_I on $U_2 \times V_2$, the latter playing the role of the interconnecting structure. Then the *composition of* $D_{(U_1 \oplus U_2)}$ *and* $D_{(V_1 \oplus V_2)}$ *via the Dirac structure* D_I, denoted $D_{(U_1 \oplus U_2)} \| _{D_I} D_{(V_1 \oplus V_2)}$, is the Dirac structure on $U_1 \times V_1$ given by:

$$D_{(U_1 \oplus U_2)} \| _{D_I} D_{(V_1 \oplus V_2)} = (\mathcal{F}\psi \circ \mathcal{B}\varphi)(D_{(U_1 \oplus U_2)} \times D_I \times D_{(V_1 \oplus V_2)}). \tag{7.2}$$

Note that $D_{(U_1 \oplus U_2)} \times D_I \times D_{(V_1 \oplus V_2)}$ is a Dirac structure on $U_1 \times U_2 \times U_2 \times V_1 \times V_2 \times V_2$ and, therefore, the composition $D_{(U_1 \oplus U_2)} \| _{D_I} D_{(V_1 \oplus V_2)}$ defines indeed a Dirac structure on $U_1 \times V_1$. The coordinate expression of the composition (7.2) is given in the following proposition:

Proposition 7.3. *With the notations above, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} D_{(U_1 \oplus U_2)} \| _{D_I} D_{(V_1 \oplus V_2)} = \{ &(u_1, v_1, \alpha_1, \beta_1) \mid \textit{there exist } (u_2, v_2, -\alpha_2, -\beta_2) \in D_I \\ &\textit{such that } (u_1, u_2, \alpha_1, \alpha_2) \in D_{(U_1 \oplus U_2)}, (v_1, v_2, \beta_1, \beta_2) \in D_{(V_1 \oplus V_2)} \}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is a computation. As a particular case, one obtains the composition in [Cervera, van der Schaft, and Baños, 2007]:

Corollary 7.4. *Let U_1, U_2 and U_3 be finite vector spaces and D_a, D_b be Dirac structures in $U_1 \times U_2$ and $U_3 \times U_2$, respectively. Let D_I be the following Dirac structure on $U_2 \times U_2$:*

$$D_I = \{(u_2, \hat{u}_2, \alpha_2, \hat{\alpha}_2) \in (U_2 \times U_2) \oplus (U_2 \times U_2)^* \mid \hat{u}_2 = -u_2, \hat{\alpha}_2 = \alpha_2\}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} D_a \| _{D_I} D_b = &\{(u_1, u_3, \alpha_1, \beta_1) \mid \textit{there exists } (u_2, \alpha_2) \in D_I \\ &\textit{such that } (u_1, u_2, \alpha_1, \alpha_2) \in D_a, (u_3, -u_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_2) \in D_b\}. \end{aligned}$$

Composition of PD-Systems. Consider now two PD-Structures A and B :

$$A = (\pi_{(U_1,M)}, \pi_{(U_2,M)}, D_{(U_1 \oplus U_2)}), \quad B = (\pi_{(V_1,N)}, \pi_{(V_2,N)}, D_{(V_1 \oplus V_2)}).$$

Note that $(U_1 \oplus U_2) \times (V_1 \oplus V_2)$ is a bundle over $M \times N$. Given a Dirac structure D_I on the vector bundle $U_2 \times V_2 \to M \times N$, we define the *composition of A and B via D_I* fiberwise, using the construction for the linear case described above. Therefore the composition is the PD-Structure:

$$A \| _{D_I} B = (\pi_{(U_1 \times V_1, M \times N)}, \{0\}, D_{(U_1 \times V_1)} = D_{(U_1 \oplus U_2)} \| _{D_I} D_{(V_1 \oplus V_2)})$$

where $\{0\}$ is the zero-dimensional vector bundle over $M \times N$ and $D_{(U_1 \times V_1)}$ is obtained at each point $(m, n) \in M \times N$ by

$$D_{(U_1 \times V_1)}(m, n) = D_{(U_1 \oplus U_2)}(m) \| _{D_I(m,n)} D_{(V_1 \oplus V_2)}(n).$$

If $(A, \mathrm{d}E_A)$ and $(B, \mathrm{d}E_B)$ are PD-Systems, one can naturally associate to them the *composition* to be $(A \| _{D_I} B, \mathrm{d}E_A + \mathrm{d}E_B)$. It should be noted that the result of the composition is a system with no ports.

Remark 7.5. It is possible to define a composition of two PD-Structures (or PD-Systems) where only some of the ports are interconnected. To do that, one starts from PD-Structures A and B where the ports are of the form $U_2 = U_2^1 \oplus U_2^2$ and $V_2 = V_2^1 \oplus V_2^2$, and considers an interconnecting Dirac structure D_I on $U_2^2 \times V_2^2 \to M \times N$. The resulting PD-Structure has ports $U_2^1 \times V_2^1 \to M \times N$.

7.3 Input-output Systems as Port-Dirac Systems

We will now discuss briefly how FIO-Systems and OFIO-Systems, as defined in Section 6, can be seen as a subclass of PD-Systems. The case of OBIO-Systems is completely analogous and we leave the details to the interested reader.

First of all, a FIO-System is easily represented by a PD-System with no ports. Recall that a FIO-System is determined by a 5-uple

$$A = \left(\pi_{(U_1,M)}, \pi_{(U_2,M)}, g_{U_2U_1}, D_{U_1}, D_{U_2}\right),$$

(with $U_1 = TM$) and an energy function $E : M \to \mathbb{R}$. One can simply consider the PD-Dirac system given by

$$\tilde{A} = \left(\pi_{(U_1,M)}, \{0\}, D_A\right)$$

and E. By definition of D_A, the Dirac systems associated to A and $\tilde{A}$ coincide.

The case of an OFIO-System A is as follows. To simplify the discussion, consider an OFIO-System of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= J(x)\frac{\partial E}{\partial x}(x) + g(x)f, \\ e &= g^T(x)\frac{\partial E}{\partial x}(x), \end{aligned} \tag{7.3}$$

that is a port-controlled generalized Hamiltonian system, see Example 6.4. Recall that J denotes the map $\sharp_\Lambda : T^*M \to TM$. Here the OFIO-Structure A is given by

$$A = \left(\pi_{(U_1,M)}, \pi_{(U_2,M)}, g_{U_2U_1}, D_\Lambda, U_2 \oplus U_2^*\right),$$

(with $U_1 = TM$ and D_Λ the graph of a bivector on M) and an energy function $E : M \to \mathbb{R}$. Consider the map (compare with (A.3)):

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi'_A \colon U_1 \oplus U_2 &\to U_1 \oplus U_2, \\ (u_1, u_2) &\mapsto (u_1 + g_{U_2U_1}(u_2), u_2). \end{aligned}$$

Define $D'_A = \mathcal{F}(\Phi'_A)(D_\Lambda \oplus D_2)$, where $D_2 = U_2 \oplus \{0\}$. Then D'_A is a Dirac structure on $U_1 \oplus U_2$ given by:

$$D'_A = \{(u_1, u_2, \alpha_1, \alpha_2) \mid (u_1 - g_{U_2U_1}(u_2), \alpha_1) \in D_\Lambda, (u_2, \alpha_2 + g^*_{U_2U_1}(\alpha_1)) \in U_2 \oplus \{0\}\}.$$

Then if we consider the PD-Structure $\tilde{A} = \left(\pi_{(U_1,M)}, \pi_{(U_2,M)}, D'_A\right)$, the PD-System $(A, \mathrm{d}E)$ is

$$(\dot{x}, f, \mathrm{d}E(x), -e) \in D'_A,$$

which gives precisely (7.3).

Composition and interconnection. It is possible to show that the operation of interconnection of two OFIO-Systems corresponds to the composition of the associated PD-Systems. Consider for simplicity two OFIO-Systems of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= J(x)\frac{\partial E}{\partial x}(x) + g(x)f, \\ e &= g^T(x)\frac{\partial E}{\partial x}(x), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\bar{x}} &= \bar{J}(\bar{x})\frac{\partial \bar{E}}{\partial \bar{x}}(\bar{x}) + \bar{g}(\bar{x})\bar{f}, \\ \bar{e} &= \bar{g}^T(\bar{x})\frac{\partial \bar{E}}{\partial \bar{x}}(\bar{x}). \end{aligned}$$

Both of them can be written in the form of a PD-System as $(\dot{x}, f, \mathrm{d}E(x), -e) \in D'_A$ and $(\dot{\bar{x}}, \bar{f}, \mathrm{d}\bar{E}(\bar{x}), -\bar{e}) \in D'_{\bar{A}}$, respectively. The composition of these two PD-Systems leads to the PD-System

$$(\dot{x}, \dot{\bar{x}}) \oplus \mathrm{d}(E + \bar{E}) \in D'_A \| _{D_I} D'_{\bar{A}}.$$

It is easy to check that this system is precisely given by the interconnection of the OFIO-Systems $(A, \mathrm{d}E)$ and $(\bar{A}, \mathrm{d}\bar{E})$ by D_I in the sense of Definition 6.12.

8 Conclusions and future work

The main contributions of this paper are:

1) We have extended the existing notion of Dirac system by using Morse families to describe a wider range of examples such as mechanics on almost Poisson structures, optimal control problems, variational calculus, etc. (Section 4). Theorem 3.5 is the main result that establishes a connection between this generalized systems and the standard Dirac systems.

2) After reviewing the notion of Dirac structures on vector bundles (Section 5), we develop a theory of Port-Dirac systems in which the intrinsic geometry is highlighted. This framework is suitable for describing the interconnection of port-systems (Section 7). Examples such as electric circuits or multi-body mechanical systems are discussed in detail. The so-called "Representation II" and "Representation III" in [Dalsmo and van der Schaft, 1999] are recovered in our approach through the backward and forward constructions. We establish a comparison between our interconnection scheme and those present in the literature. In particular, the tensor product of Dirac structures, already used in the context of interconnection (see [Jacobs and Yoshimura, 2014] and references therein), is recovered.

3) We provide examples (see for instance Example 6.8) to show that the notion of generalized Dirac system is useful for Port-Dirac systems.

Future work includes:

a) Starting from the notions introduced in Sections 6 and 7, we would like to find a categorical language to describe the relevant definitions and operations in the theory of Port-Dirac systems. We believe that the understanding of many constructions in the literature of Port-Hamiltonian systems would benefit from such a categorical language. We refer to the recent survey [van der Schaft and Dimitri, 2014] for details and further references.

   For instance, using a suitable definition of morphisms in the category as maps which preserve the relevant Dirac geometry, one might be able to cast many reduction results in a uniform geometric framework. This would include the symmetry reduction of the examples discussed in this paper and the relation between them (for instance, it is known that linear Poisson structures typically arise in mechanics after a Poisson reduction of the standard Poisson structure on the cotangent bundle).

b) The derivation of explicit solutions of Dirac systems is usually very difficult or even impossible and, therefore, it would be interesting to derive ad-hoc numerical methods to tackle this problem. In this sense, our paper clearly uncovers the underlying geometry of these Dirac systems and the interconnection of them from simpler pieces. We intend to study in a future paper the discrete version of the previous construction identifying a suitable notion of discrete Dirac structure,

its relation with Morse functions and their interconnection. This discrete version could possible lead us to introduce new geometric integrators (see [Marsden and West, 2001, Hairer, Lubich, and Wanner, 2010]) discretizing the principles instead of the full differential-algebraic equations. Some steps in this direction have already appeared in [Parks and Leok, 2017]

c) Recently, there has been an increasing interest in modeling engineering and robotic systems which typically involve a hybrid description of both continuous and discrete dynamics (see e.g. [van der Schaft and Schumacher, 2000]). In some cases, this is addressed employing a mixture of logic-based switching and difference/differential equations [Liberzon, 2003]. Many systems in engineering and some physical systems can be modeled using such a mathematical framework and it is natural to think that Dirac structures may be useful to model some classes of hybrid systems.

A Natural maps and commutative diagrams

There are some interesting relations between the Dirac structure D_{ω_Q} on T^*Q, given by the graph of ω_Q, and the spaces TT^*Q, T^*T^*Q and T^*TQ appearing in the Tulczyjew triple. Let us first recall that there are canonically defined isomorphisms whose local expressions are

$$\begin{aligned} \flat_{\omega_Q} &: TT^*Q \to T^*T^*Q\,, \qquad (q^i, p_i, \dot{q}^i, \dot{p}_i) \mapsto (q^i, p_i, -\dot{p}_i, \dot{q}^i), \\ \alpha_Q &: TT^*Q \to T^*TQ\,, \qquad (q^i, p_i, \dot{q}^i, \dot{p}_i) \mapsto (q^i, \dot{q}^i, \dot{p}_i, p_i). \end{aligned}$$

The intrinsic definition of these maps, and the motivation behind them, can be found in [Tulczyjew, 1976a,b]. With these maps in mind, and noting that D_{ω_Q} reads

$$D_{\omega_Q} = \left\{ (q^i, p_i, \dot{q}^i, \dot{p}_i, \alpha_i, \beta^i) \;\middle|\; \dot{p}_i + \alpha_i = 0,\, \dot{q}^i - \beta^i = 0 \right\}, \tag{A.1}$$

we will define diffeomorphisms Ψ_1, Ψ_2 and Ψ_3 from D_{ω_Q} to the spaces TT^*Q, T^*TQ and T^*T^*Q, respectively. Namely, if we denote by pr_1 and pr_2 the projections of $TT^*Q \oplus T^*T^*Q$ onto TT^*Q and T^*T^*Q, and by $i_{D_{\omega_Q}} : D_{\omega_Q} \hookrightarrow TT^*Q \oplus T^*T^*Q$, then we set:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_1 &: D_{\omega_Q} \subset TT^*Q \oplus T^*T^*Q \to TT^*Q\,, \qquad \Psi_1 = \mathrm{pr}_1 \circ i_{D_{\omega_Q}}, \\ \Psi_2 &: D_{\omega_Q} \subset TT^*Q \oplus T^*T^*Q \to T^*T^*Q\,, \qquad \Psi_2 = \mathrm{pr}_2 \circ i_{D_{\omega_Q}}, \\ \Psi_3 &: D_{\omega_Q} \subset TT^*Q \oplus T^*T^*Q \to T^*T^*Q\,, \qquad \Psi_3 = \alpha_Q \circ \Psi_1. \end{aligned}$$

These maps and their coordinate expressions are shown in Diagram A.1 (where $\sharp_{\omega_Q}$ is the inverse of $\flat_{\omega_Q}$).

One might also relate D_{ω_Q} to the Dirac structure D_M on $M = TQ \oplus T^*Q$, given by the graph of the pullback of ω_Q to M. In coordinates

$$D_M = \left\{ (q^i, v^i, p_i, \dot{q}^i, \dot{v}^i, \dot{p}_i, \alpha_i, \gamma_i, \beta^i) \;\middle|\; \dot{p}_i + \alpha_i = 0,\, \gamma_i = 0,\, \dot{q}^i - \beta^i = 0 \right\}. \tag{A.2}$$



Diagram A.1: The maps Ψ_1, Ψ_2 and Ψ_3.

There are natural maps

$$T^*Q \xleftarrow{\mathrm{pr}_{T^*Q}} M = TQ \oplus T^*Q \xrightarrow{i_M} T^*TQ$$

where pr_{T^*Q} is the projection onto T^*Q, and $i_M \colon M \to T^*TQ$ is the inclusion (it is a vector bundle inclusion, see [Cendra, Etchechoury, and Ferraro, 2014] for a definition). In coordinates, $i_M(q,v,p) = (q,v,p,0)$. The basic observation is that the spaces T^*Q and T^*TQ both have canonical Dirac structures D_{ω_Q} and $D_{\omega_{TQ}}$, and that D_M can be obtained via the backward of these structures by either the projection or the inclusion, i.e. $D_M = \mathcal{B}(T\mathrm{pr}_{T^*Q})(D_{\omega_Q}) = \mathcal{B}(Ti_M)(D_{\omega_{TQ}})$. We summarize the situation in an enlarged diagram (Diagram A.2).



Diagram A.2: D_M and D_{ω_Q}.

The map $\Phi \colon D_M \to D_{\omega_Q}$ is a vector bundle morphisms over the projection pr_{T^*Q}, in coordinates

$$\Phi(q^i, v^i, p_i, \dot q^i, \dot v^i, \dot p_i, \alpha_i, \gamma_i, \beta^i) = (q^i, p_i, \dot q^i, \dot p_i, \alpha_i, \beta^i). \tag{A.3}$$

A coordinate-free definition is $\Phi = T\mathrm{pr}_{T^*Q} \oplus T^*i_{T^*Q}$, where $i_{T^*Q} \colon T^*Q \to M = TQ \oplus T^*Q$ is the inclusion $i_{T^*Q}(q,p) = (q,0,p)$, and $T^*i_{T^*Q}$ is the cotangent map of i_{T^*Q}.

In the case of a linear almost Poisson bracket discussed in Section 4.2, there is a similar commutative diagram for $D_{\mathcal{A}^*}$ (compare with Diagram A.1):



To define the maps involved, let us first recall the existence of a canonical isomorphism $\mathcal{R}\colon T^*\mathcal{A}^* \to T^*\mathcal{A}$, in coordinates

$$\mathcal{R}(q^i, p_A, \alpha_i, \beta^A) = (q^i, \beta^A, -\alpha_i, p_A).$$

The map ε in the diagram is such that the following diagram is commutative



(in particular, it depends on the Poisson structure chosen). In coordinates, we find

$$\varepsilon(q^i, v^A, \alpha_i, \gamma_A) = (q^i, \gamma_A, \rho^i_A v^A, C^D_{BA} v^B \gamma_D - \rho^i_A \alpha_i).$$

We refer the reader to [Grabowska, Urbański, and Grabowski, 2006, Grabowski and Urbański, 1999] for more details. We can now define the maps Ψ_1, Ψ_2 and Ψ_3. Denote by pr_1 and pr_2 the projections of $T\mathcal{A}^* \oplus T^*\mathcal{A}^*$ onto $T^*\mathcal{A}^*$ and $T\mathcal{A}^*$, and $i_{D_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}^*}}} : D_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}^*}} \to T\mathcal{A}^* \oplus T^*\mathcal{A}^*$ the inclusion. Then:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Psi_1\colon D_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}^*}} \to T\mathcal{A}^*, && \Psi_1 = \mathrm{pr}_1 \circ i_{D_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}^*}}},\\
&\Psi_2\colon D_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}^*}} \to T^*\mathcal{A}^*, && \Psi_2 = \mathrm{pr}_2 \circ i_{D_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}^*}}},\\
&\Psi_3\colon D_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}^*}} \to T^*\mathcal{A}, && \Psi_3 = \mathcal{R} \circ \mathrm{pr}_2 \circ i_{D_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}^*}}} = \mathcal{R} \circ \Psi_2.
\end{aligned}$$

The coordinate expressions are summarized in the following diagram:



We also have an enlarged commutative diagram generalizing Diagram A.2:



where $D_M = \mathcal{B}(T\pi_{(M,\mathcal{A}^*)})\left(D_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}^*}}\right)$ and the map Φ is defined analogously to (A.3).

B Isotropic, coisotropic and Dirac structures

We will give a useful description of Dirac, isotropic and coisotropic structures. Recall that the simplest cases of Dirac structures are those given by a form ω or a bivector Λ, namely the Dirac structures D_ω and D_Λ given by the graph of $\omega^\flat\colon V \to V^*$ and $\sharp_\Lambda\colon V^* \to V$ respectively. The cases $\omega = 0$ and $\Lambda = 0$ yield the Dirac structures $D_\omega = V \oplus \{0\}$ and $D_\Lambda = \{0\} \oplus V^*$. If $\Sigma \subset V \oplus V^*$ is a subspace, we will use the notations F_Σ and $F_\Sigma^{(*)}$ for the projections of Σ on V and V^*. In particular, for a Dirac structure D we write F_D and $F_D^{(*)}$.

Assume that $F \subset V$ is a subspace and ω_F is a 2-form on F. We can define the Dirac structure on V given by

$$D_{V,\omega_F} = \{(v,\alpha) \in V \oplus V^* \mid v \in F,\ \omega_F(v,w) = \alpha(w) \text{ for all } w \in F\},$$

which should not be confused with D_{ω_F} which is a Dirac structure on F. If we choose a complement F_1 of F so that $V = F \oplus F_1$, we represent an element $v \in V$ as (v_0, v_1) and an element $\alpha \in V^*$ as $(\alpha_0, \alpha_1) \in F^* \oplus F_1^*$. The Dirac structure D_{V,ω_F} can then be represented as a direct sum of two Dirac structures on F and F_1 as follows

$$D_{V,\omega_F} = D_{\omega_F} \oplus (\{0\} \oplus F_1^*) \subset (F \oplus F^*) \oplus (F_1 \oplus F_1^*)\,,$$

where $\{0\} \oplus F_1^*$ is the Dirac structure on F_1 given by the bivector $\Lambda = 0$. Note that for the Dirac structure D_{V,ω_F} one has $F_{D_{V,\omega_F}} = F$.

Conversely, let D be a given Dirac structure on V. In F_D we can define a presymplectic structure ω_{F_D} defined by the condition $\omega_{F_D}(v_1, v_2) = \alpha(v_2)$, for all $v_1, v_2 \in F_D$ and all α such that $(v_1, \alpha) \in D$. The proof that ω_{F_D} is a well defined form only makes use of the isotropy of D which implies that if $\Sigma \subset V \oplus V^*$ is an isotropic subspace, one can also define a 2-form ω_{F_Σ} on F_Σ. Then applying the previous construction with $F = F_D$ and $\omega_F = \omega_{F_D}$ we recover the Dirac structure D, that is, $D_{V,\omega_{F_D}} = D$.

Using the representation D_{V,ω_F} of a given Dirac structure on V one can describe the family of all isotropic structures Σ on V such that $F_\Sigma = F$. In fact, it is easy to check that Σ must be of the form $\Sigma = D_{\omega_F} \oplus \{0\} \oplus F_2^{\circ_{F_1}}$ where F_2 represents an arbitrary subspace of F_1 and $F_2^{\circ_{F_1}}$ denotes the annihilator of F_2 in

F_1, i.e. $F_2^{\circ_{F_1}} = \{\alpha \in F_1^* \mid \alpha(v) = 0, \text{ for all } v \in F_2\}$. Therefore $F_2^{\circ_{F_1}}$ represents an arbitrary subspace of F_1^*. The latter subspace is maximal if $F_2 = \{0\}$ which gives $\Sigma = D_{V,\omega_F}$ and it is minimal if $F_2 = F_1$, which gives $\Sigma = D_{\omega_F} \oplus \{0\} \oplus \{0\}$.

Any coisotropic structure on V can be described as the orthogonal complement of an isotropic structure $\Sigma = D_{\omega_F} \oplus \{0\} \oplus F_2^{\circ_{F_1}}$ as described above, which gives $\Sigma^\perp = D_{\omega_F} \oplus F_2 \oplus F_1^*$. The latter subspace is maximal if $F_2 = F_1$ which gives $\Sigma^\perp = D_{\omega_F} \oplus F_1 \oplus F_1^*$ and it is minimal if $F_2 = \{0\}$ which gives $\Sigma^\perp = D_{\omega_F} \oplus \{0\} \oplus F_1^* = D_{V,\omega_F}$. Note that $F_{(\Sigma^\perp)} = F_\Sigma \oplus F_2$ which contains F_Σ and it is equal to it if and only if $F_2 = \{0\}$ which, in turn, happens if and only if $\Sigma^\perp = \Sigma$, that is, Σ is a Dirac structure.

Furthermore, $F_2 \oplus F_1^*$ can be decomposed as $F_2 \oplus F_1^* = F_2 \oplus F_2^* \oplus F_3^*$ where $F_3 \subset F_1$ is any subspace of F_1 such that $F_2 \oplus F_3 = F_1$, and we can conclude that $\Sigma^\perp$ can be decomposed as the direct sum of three structures corresponding to the decomposition $V = F \oplus F_3 \oplus F_2$, namely $\Sigma^\perp = D_{\omega_F} \oplus (\{0\} \oplus F_3^*) \oplus F_2 \oplus F_2^*$. Note that $D_{F \oplus F_3, \omega_F} := D_{\omega_F} \oplus (\{0\} \oplus F_3^*)$ is a Dirac structure on $F \oplus F_3$ and $F_2 \oplus F_2^*$ is the maximal coisotropic structure on F_2.

References

R. Abraham and J.E. Marsden. *Foundations of mechanics*. Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Co. Inc. Advanced Book Program, Reading, Mass., 1978. Second edition, revised and enlarged, With the assistance of Tudor Raţiu and Richard Cushman.

V.I. Arnold, V.V. Kozlov, and A. I. Neĭshtadt. *Dynamical systems. III*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1988. Translated from the Russian by A. Iacob.

M. Barbero-Liñán, D. Iglesias Ponte, and D. Martín de Diego. Morse families in optimal control problems. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 53(1):414–433, 2015. ISSN 0363-0129. doi: 10.1137/120903488. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/120903488.

A. M. Bloch. *Nonholonomic mechanics and control*, volume 24 of *Interdisciplinary Applied Mathematics*. Springer, New York, second edition, 2015. ISBN 978-1-4939-3016-6; 978-1-4939-3017-3. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4939-3017-3. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-3017-3. With the collaboration of J. Bailieul, P. E. Crouch, J. E. Marsden and D. Zenkov, With scientific input from P. S. Krishnaprasad and R. M. Murray.

A.M. Bloch, J.E. Marsden, and D.V. Zenkov. Quasivelocities and symmetries in non-holonomic systems. *Dyn. Syst.*, 24(2):187–222, 2009. ISSN 1468-9367. doi: 10.1080/14689360802609344. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14689360802609344.

H. Bursztyn. A brief introduction to Dirac manifolds. In *Geometric and topological methods for quantum field theory*, pages 4–38. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2013.

H. Bursztyn and O. Radko. Gauge equivalence of Dirac structures and symplectic groupoids. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 53(1):309–337, 2003. ISSN 0373-0956. URL http://aif.cedram.org/item?id=AIF_2003__53_1_309_0.

F. Cantrijn, M. de León, and D. Martín de Diego. On almost-Poisson structures in nonholonomic mechanics. *Nonlinearity*, 12(3):721–737, 1999. ISSN 0951-7715. doi: 10.1088/0951-7715/12/3/316. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0951-7715/12/3/316.

H. Cendra and J.E. Marsden. Lin constraints, Clebsch potentials and variational principles. *Phys. D*, 27(1-2):63–89, 1987. ISSN 0167-2789. doi: 10.1016/0167-2789(87)90005-4. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0167-2789(87)90005-4.

H. Cendra, L.A. Ibort, and J.E. Marsden. Horizontal Lin constraints, Clebsch potentials and variational principles on principal fiber bundles. In *XV International Colloquium on Group Theoretical Methods in Physics (Philadelphia, PA, 1986)*, pages 446–450. World Sci. Publ., Teaneck, NJ, 1987.

H. Cendra, M. Etchechoury, and S.J. Ferraro. An extension of the Dirac and Gotay-Nester theories of constraints for Dirac dynamical systems. *J. Geom. Mech.*, 6(2):167–236, 2014. ISSN 1941-4889. doi: 10.3934/jgm.2014.6.167. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.3934/jgm.2014.6.167.

H. Cendra, T.S. Ratiu, and H. Yoshimura. Dirac-weinstein reduction. Preprint, 2017.

J. Cervera, A.J. van der Schaft, and A. Baños. Interconnection of port-Hamiltonian systems and composition of Dirac structures. *Automatica J. IFAC*, 43(2):212–225, 2007. ISSN 0005-1098. doi: 10.1016/j.automatica.2006.08.014. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.automatica.2006.08.014.

J. Cortés, M. de León, D. Martín de Diego, and S. Martínez. Geometric description of vakonomic and nonholonomic dynamics. Comparison of solutions. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 41(5):1389–1412, 2002. ISSN 0363-0129. doi: 10.1137/S036301290036817X. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/S036301290036817X.

J. Cortés, M. de León, J.C. Marrero, and E. Martínez. Nonholonomic Lagrangian systems on Lie algebroids. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 24(2):213–271, 2009. ISSN 1078-0947. doi: 10.3934/dcds.2009.24.213. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.3934/dcds.2009.24.213.

T. Courant and A. Weinstein. Beyond Poisson structures. In *Action hamiltoniennes de groupes. Troisième théorème de Lie (Lyon, 1986)*, volume 27 of *Travaux en Cours*, pages 39–49. Hermann, Paris, 1988.

T.J. Courant. Dirac manifolds. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 319(2):631–661, 1990.

M. Crampin and T. Mestdag. Anholonomic frames in constrained dynamics. *Dyn. Syst.*, 25(2):159–187, 2010. ISSN 1468-9367. doi: 10.1080/14689360903360888. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14689360903360888.

M. Dalsmo and A.J. van der Schaft. On representations and integrability of mathematical structures in energy-conserving physical systems. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 37(1):54–91, 1999. ISSN 0363-0129. doi: 10.1137/S0363012996312039. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/S0363012996312039.

M. de León and P.R. Rodrigues. *Methods of differential geometry in analytical mechanics*, volume 158 of *North-Holland Mathematics Studies*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1989. ISBN 0-444-88017-8.

M. de León, J.C. Marrero, and D. Martín de Diego. Linear almost Poisson structures and Hamilton-Jacobi equation. Applications to nonholonomic mechanics. *J. Geom. Mech.*, 2(2):159–198, 2010. ISSN 1941-4889. doi: 10.3934/jgm.2010.2.159. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.3934/jgm.2010.2.159.

K. Grabowska and J. Grabowski. Dirac algebroids in Lagrangian and Hamiltonian mechanics. *J. Geom. Phys.*, 61(11):2233–2253, 2011. ISSN 0393-0440. doi: 10.1016/j.geomphys.2011.06.018. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.geomphys.2011.06.018.

K. Grabowska, P. Urbański, and J. Grabowski. Geometrical mechanics on algebroids. *Int. J. Geom. Methods Mod. Phys.*, 3(3):559–575, 2006. ISSN 0219-8878. doi: 10.1142/S0219887806001259. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1142/S0219887806001259.

J. Grabowski and P. Urbański. Algebroids—general differential calculi on vector bundles. *J. Geom. Phys.*, 31(2-3):111–141, 1999. ISSN 0393-0440. doi: 10.1016/S0393-0440(99)00007-8. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0393-0440(99)00007-8.

J. Grabowski, M. de León, J. C. Marrero, and D. Martín de Diego. Nonholonomic constraints: a new viewpoint. *J. Math. Phys.*, 50(1):013520, 17, 2009. ISSN 0022-2488. doi: 10.1063/1.3049752. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.3049752.

M. Gualtieri. Generalized complex geometry. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 174(1): 75–123, 2011. ISSN 0003-486X. doi: 10.4007/annals.2011.174.1.3. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.4007/annals.2011.174.1.3.

V. Guillemin and S. Sternberg. *Geometric asymptotics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1977. Mathematical Surveys, No. 14.

E. Hairer, C. Lubich, and G. Wanner. *Geometric numerical integration*, volume 31 of *Springer Series in Computational Mathematics*. Springer, Heidelberg, 2010. ISBN 978-3-642-05157-9. Structure-preserving algorithms for ordinary differential equations, Reprint of the second (2006) edition.

R. Hermann. The differential geometry of foliations. II. *J. Math. Mech.*, 11:303–315, 1962.

D. Holm, J.E. Marsden, and T.S. Ratiu. The Euler-Poincaré equations and semidirect products with applications to continuum theories. *Adv. Math.*, 137(1):1–81, 1998. ISSN 0001-8708. doi: 10.1006/aima.1998.1721. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/aima.1998.1721.

D.D. Holm. *Geometric mechanics. Part I.* Imperial College Press, London, second edition, 2011. ISBN 978-1-84816-775-9; 1-84816-775-X. Dynamics and symmetry.

L. Hörmander. Fourier integral operators. I. *Acta Math.*, 127(1-2):79–183, 1971.

D. Iglesias, J.C. Marrero, D. Martín de Diego, and D. Sosa. Singular Lagrangian systems and variational constrained mechanics on Lie algebroids. *Dyn. Syst.*, 23 (3):351–397, 2008.

H.O. Jacobs and H. Yoshimura. Tensor products of Dirac structures and interconnection in Lagrangian mechanics. *J. Geom. Mech.*, 6(1): 67–98, 2014. ISSN 1941-4889. doi: 10.3934/jgm.2014.6.67. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.3934/jgm.2014.6.67.

P. Libermann and C.-M. Marle. *Symplectic geometry and analytical mechanics*, volume 35 of *Mathematics and its Applications*. D. Reidel Publishing Co., Dordrecht, 1987. Translated from the French by Bertram Eugene Schwarzbach.

D. Liberzon. *Switching in systems and control*. Systems & Control: Foundations & Applications. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2003. ISBN 0-8176-4297-8. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4612-0017-8. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-0017-8.

C. Lobry. Contrôlabilité des systèmes non linéaires. *SIAM J. Control*, 8:573–605, 1970. ISSN 0363-0129.

J.E. Marsden and T.S. Ratiu. *Introduction to mechanics and symmetry*, volume 17 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1999. ISBN 0-387-98643-X. doi: 10.1007/978-0-387-21792-5. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-21792-5. A basic exposition of classical mechanical systems.

J.E. Marsden and M. West. Discrete mechanics and variational integrators. *Acta Numer.*, 10:357–514, 2001. ISSN 0962-4929. doi: 10.1017/S096249290100006X. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S096249290100006X.

E. Martínez. Lie algebroids in classical mechanics and optimal control. *SIGMA Symmetry Integrability Geom. Methods Appl.*, 3:Paper 050, 17, 2007. ISSN 1815-0659. doi: 10.3842/SIGMA.2007.050. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.3842/SIGMA.2007.050.

J. Merker. On the geometric structure of Hamiltonian systems with ports. *J. Nonlinear Sci.*, 19(6):717–738, 2009. ISSN 0938-8974. doi: 10.1007/s00332-009-9052-3. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00332-009-9052-3.

H. Parks and M. Leok. Variational integrators for interconnected lagrange–dirac systems. *Journal of Nonlinear Science*, pages 1–36, 2017. ISSN 1432-1467. doi: 10.1007/s00332-017-9364-7. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00332-017-9364-7.

L.S. Pontryagin, V.G. Boltyanskiĭ, R.V. Gamkrelidze, and E.F. Mishchenko. *Selected works. Vol. 4.* Classics of Soviet Mathematics. Gordon & Breach Science Publishers, New York, 1986. ISBN 2-88124-134-4. The mathematical theory of optimal processes, Edited and with a preface by R. V. Gamkrelidze, Translated from the Russian by K. N. Trirogoff, Translation edited by L. W. Neustadt, With a preface by L. W. Neustadt and K. N. Trirogoff, Reprint of the 1962 English translation.

W.M. Tulczyjew. Les sous-variétés lagrangiennes et la dynamique lagrangienne. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B*, 283(8):Av, A675–A678, 1976a.

W.M. Tulczyjew. Les sous-variétés lagrangiennes et la dynamique hamiltonienne. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B*, 283(8):Av, 15–18, 1976b.

A.J. van der Schaft and J. Dimitri. Port-hamiltonian systems theory: An introductory overview. *Foundations and Trends in Systems and Control*, 1 (2-3):173–378, 2014. ISSN 2325-6818. doi: 10.1561/2600000002. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1561/2600000002.

A.J. van der Schaft and B. Maschke. The hamiltonian formulation of energy conserving physical systems with external ports. *AEU. Archiv für Elektronik und Übertragungstechnik*, 49(5-6):362–371, 1995.

A.J. van der Schaft and B.M. Maschke. On the Hamiltonian formulation of nonholonomic mechanical systems. *Rep. Math. Phys.*, 34(2):225–233, 1994. ISSN 0034-4877. doi: 10.1016/0034-4877(94)90038-8. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0034-4877(94)90038-8.

A.J. van der Schaft and H. Schumacher. *An introduction to hybrid dynamical systems*, volume 251 of *Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences*. Springer-Verlag London, Ltd., London, 2000. ISBN 1-85233-233-6. doi: 10.1007/BFb0109998. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BFb0109998.

A. Weinstein. Symplectic manifolds and their Lagrangian submanifolds. *Advances in Math.*, 6:329–346, 1971. ISSN 0001-8708.

H. Yoshimura and J.E. Marsden. Dirac structures in Lagrangian mechanics. I. Implicit Lagrangian systems. *J. Geom. Phys.*, 57(1):133–156, 2006.